

(81)

GREAT SPEECH OF HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

AGAINST THE LECOMPTON CONSTITUTION,

IN SENATE, MARCH 3d, 1858.

[We publish this morning Governor Seward's masterpiece complete. The Senator's Washington friends pronounce it the greatest effort of his life. It is the production of a great mind, and adds a cubit to the stature of the great statesman. During the delivery, the Southern Senators paid closer attention to his arguments, and greater deference to the speaker, than they ever before exhibited. At an early hour the lobbies and galleries were thronged with distinguished persons and ladies. The floor of the Senate was crowded with members of the house and of the diplomatic corps.

The first half of the speech is historical; it is a graphic and powerful review of the great Slave and Free State struggle, from the days of the Revolution to the opening of Buchanan's Administration, described in language equal to Macaulay's best effort, for beauty, strength and clearness of diction. The Senator's glance at the Dred Scott jugglery is withering and overwhelming. The conclusion of his argument is truly majestic. We can say with a cotemporary, "We think no one can raise from its careful perusal without a higher estimate of its author, and a profounder appreciation of the great cause of Liberty in Labor which has enlisted his noblest energies, and is now arousing the enthusiasm of the country."—*Chicago Tribune, March 9.*]

MR. PRESIDENT: Eight years ago we slew the Wilmot Proviso in the Senate Chamber, and buried it with triumphant demonstrations under the floors of the Capitol. Four years later, we exploded altogether the time-honored system of governing the Territories by Federal rules and regulations, and published and proclaimed in its stead, a new gospel of popular sovereignty, whose ways, like those of wisdom, were to be flowery paths of peace. Nevertheless the question whether there shall be Slavery or no Slavery in the Territories, is again the stirring passage of the day. The restless Proviso has burst the cerements of the grave, and, striking hands here in our very presence with the gentle spirit of popular sovereignty run mad, is seen raging freely in our halls, scattering dismay among the Administration benches in both Houses. Thus an old unwelcome lesson is read to us anew. The question of Slavery in the Federal Territories, which are the nurseries of future States, independently of all its moral and humane elements, involves a dynastical struggle of two antagonistical systems, the labor of slaves and the labor of freemen, for mastery in the Federal Union. One of these systems partakes of an aristocratic character; the other is purely democratic. Each one of the existing States has staked, or it will ultimately, not only its internal welfare, but also its influence in the Federal councils, on the decision of that contest. Such a struggle is not to be arrested, quelled or reconciled by temporary expedients or compromises.

Mr. President, I always engage reluctantly in these discussions, which awaken passion just in the degree that their importance demands the impartial umpirage of reason. This reluctance deepens now, when I look around, and count the able contestants who have newly entered the lists on either side, and shadowy forms of many great and honored statesmen, who once were eloquent in these disputes, but whose tongues have since become stringless instruments, rise up before me. It is, however, a maxim in military science, that in preparation for war, every one should think as if the last event depended on his counsel, and in every great battle each one should fight as if he were the only champion. The principle, perhaps, is equally sound in political affairs. If it be possible, I shall perform my present duty in such a way as to wound no just sensibilities. I must, however, review the action of Presidents, Senates and Congresses. I do, indeed, with all my heart, reject the instructions given by the Italian master of political science, which teaches that all men are bad by nature, and that they will not fail to show this depravity when they have a fair opportunity. But jealousy of executive power is high, practical virtue in Republics; and we shall find it hard to deny the justice of the character of free legislative bodies, which Charles James Fox drew, when he said that the British House of Commons, of which he was at the moment equally an ornament and an idol, like every other popular assembly, must be viewed as a mass of men capable of too much attachment and too much animosity, capable of being biased by weak and even wicked motives, and liable to be governed by ministerial influences, by caprice, and by corruption.

Mr. President, I propose to enquire, in the first place, why the question before us is attended by real or apparent dangers.

I think our apprehensions are in part due to the intrinsic importance of the transaction concerned. Whenever we add a new column to the Federal colonade, we need to lay its foundation so firmly, to shape its shaft with such just proportions, to poise it with such exactness, and to adjust its connections with the existing structure so carefully, that instead of falling prematurely, and dragging other and venerable columns with it to the ground, it may stand erect forever, increasing the grandeur and stability of the whole massive and imperial fabric. Still the admission of a new State is not necessarily or even customarily attended by either embarrassments or alarms. We have already admitted eighteen new States without serious commotions, except in the cases of Missouri, Texas and California. We are even now admitting two others, Minnesota and Oregon; and these transactions go on so smoothly, that only close observers are aware that we are thus consolidating our dominion on the shores of Lake Superior, and almost at the gates of the Arctic Ocean.

It is manifest that the apprehended difficulties in the present case have some relation to the dispute concerning Slavery, which is raging within the Territory of Kansas. Yet, it must be remembered that nine of the new States which have been admitted, expressly established Slavery, or tolerated it, and nine of them forbade it. The excitement, therefore, is due to peculiar circumstances. I think there are three of them, namely:

First. That whereas in the beginning, the ascendancy of the Slave States was absolute, it is now being reversed.

Second. That whereas, heretofore, the National Government favored this change of balance from the Slave States to the Free States, it has now reversed this policy and opposes the change.

Third. That National intervention in the Territories in favor of Slave-

labor and Slave States, is opposed to the natural, social and moral developments of the Republic.

It seems almost unnecessary to demonstrate the first of these propositions. In the beginning there were twelve Slave States, and only one that was free. Now, six of those twelve have become free; and there are sixteen Free States to fifteen Slave States. If the three candidates now here, Kansas, Minnesota and Oregon, shall be admitted as Free States, then there will be nineteen Free States to fifteen Slave States. Originally there were twenty-four Senators of Slave States, and only two of a Free State; now there are thirty-two Senators of Free States, and thirty of Slave States. In the first Constitutional Congress the Slave States had fifty-seven Representatives, and the one Free State had only eight; now the Free States have one hundred and forty-four Representatives, while the Slave States have only ninety. These changes have happened in a period during which the Slave States have almost uninterruptedly exercised paramount influence in the Government, and notwithstanding the Constitution itself has opposed well-known checks to the relative increase of representation of Free States. I assume, therefore, the truth of my first proposition.

I suggested, sir, a second circumstance, namely: That whereas, in the earlier age of the Republic, the National Government favored this change, yet it has since altogether reversed that policy, and it now opposes the change. I do not claim that heretofore the National Government always, or even habitually, intervened in the Territories in favor of Free States, but only that such intervention preponderated. While Slavery existed in all of the States but one, at the beginning, yet it was far less intense in the Northern than in some of the Southern States. All of the former contemplated an early emancipation. The fathers seem not to have anticipated an enlargement of the national territory; consequently, they expected that all the new States to be thereafter admitted, would be organized upon subdivisions of the then existing States, or upon divisions of the then existing national domain. That domain lay behind the thirteen States, and stretched from the Lakes to the Gulf, and was bounded westward by the Mississippi. It was naturally divided by the Ohio River, and the Northwest Territory and the Southwest Territory were organized on that division. It was foreseen, even then, that the new States to be admitted would ultimately overbalance the thirteen original ones. They were, however, mainly to be yet planted and matured in the desert, with the agency of human labor.

The fathers knew only of two kinds of labor, the same which now exist among ourselves—namely, the labor of African slaves and the labor of free-men. The former then predominated in the country as it did throughout the continent. A confessed deficiency of slave labor could be supplied only by domestic increase, and by continuance of the then existing importation from Africa. The supply of free labor depended on domestic increase, and a voluntary immigration from Europe. Settlements which had thus early taken on a free labor character, or a slave character, were already maturing in those parts of the old States which were to be ultimately detached and formed into new States. When new States of this class were organized, they were admitted promptly, either as free States or as slave States, without objection. Thus Vermont, a free State, was admitted in 1791: Kentucky, a slave State, 1792; and Tennessee, also a slave State, in 1796. Five new States were contemplated to be erected in the Northwest Territory. Practically it was unoccupied, and therefore open to labor of either

kind. The one kind or the other, in the absence of any anticipated emulation, would predominate, just as Congress should intervene to favor it. Congress intervened in favor of free labor. This, indeed, was an act of the Continental Congress, but it was confirmed by the first Constitutional Congress. The fathers simultaneously adopted three other measures of less direct intervention. First, they initiated in 1789, and completed in 1808, the absolute suppression of the African slave trade. Secondly, they organized systems of foreign commerce and navigation, which stimulated voluntary immigration from Europe.—Thirdly, they established an easy, simple and uniform process of naturalization. The change of the balance of power from the slave States to the free States, which we are now witnessing, is due chiefly to those four early measures of national intervention in favor of free labor. It would have taken place much sooner, if the borders of the Republic had remained unchanged. The purchase of Louisiana and the acquisition of Florida, however, were transactions resulting from high political necessities, in disregard of the question between free labor and slave labor. In admitting the new State of Louisiana, which was organized on the slave labor settlement of New Orleans, Congress practiced the same neutrality which it had before exercised in the States of Kentucky and Tennessee. No serious dispute arose until 1819, when Missouri, organized within the former province of Louisiana, upon a slave labor settlement in St. Louis, applied for admission as a slave State, and Arkansas was manifestly preparing to appear soon in the same character. The balance of power between the slave States and the free States was already reduced to an equilibrium, and the eleven free States had an equal representation with the eleven slave States in the Senate of the United States. The slave States unanimously insisted on an unqualified admission of Missouri. The free States with less unanimity, demanded that the new State should renounce Slavery. The controversy seemed to shake the Union to its foundation, and it was terminated by a compromise. Missouri was admitted as a slave State, Arkansas, rather, by implication than by express agreement, was to be admitted, and and it was afterwards admitted, as a slave State. On the other hand, slavery was prohibited in all that part of the old province of Louisiana yet remaining unoccupied, which lay north of the parallel of $36^{\circ} 30'$ north latitude. The reservation for free labor included the immense region now known as the territories of Kansas and Nebraska, and seemed ample for eight, ten, or more, free States. The severity of the struggle and the conditions of the compromise, indicated very plainly, however, that the vigor of national intervention in favor of free labor and free States was exhausted. Still, the existing statutes were adequate to secure an ultimate ascendancy of the free States.

The policy of intervention in favor of slave labor and slave States began with the further removal of the borders of the Republic. I cheerfully admit that this policy has not been persistent or exclusive, and claim only that it has been and yet is predominant. I am not now to deplore the annexation of Texas. I remark simply that it was a bold measure, of doubtful constitutionality, distinctly adopted as an act of intervention in favor of slave labor, and made or intended to be most effective by the stipulation that the new State of Texas may hereafter be divided and so reorganized as to constitute five slave States. This great act cast a long shadow before it—a shadow which perplexed the people of the free States. It was then that a feeble social movement, which aimed by moral persuasion at the manumission of slaves, gave place to political organizations, which have ever

since gone on increasing in energy and extent, directed against a further extension of Slavery in the United States. The war between the United States and Mexico, and the acquisition of the Mexican provinces of New Mexico and Upper California, the fruits of that war, were so immediately and directly consequences of the annexation of Texas, that all of those events in fact may be regarded as constituting one act of intervention in favor of slave labor and slave States. The field of the strife between the two systems had become widely enlarged, Indeed, it was now continental. The amazing mineral wealth of California stimulated settlements there, with a rapidity like that of vegetation. The Mexican law which prevailed in the newly acquired Territories dedicated them to free labor, and thus the astounding question arose for the first time, whether the United States of America, whose Constitution was based upon the principle of the political equality of all men, would blight and curse with Slavery a conquered land which enjoyed universal Freedom. The slave States denied the obligation of these laws, and insisted on their abrogation. The free States maintained them, and demanded their confirmation through the enactment of the Wilmot Proviso. The slave States and the free States were yet in equilibrium.

The controversy continued here two years. The settlers of the new Territories became impatient, and precipitated a solution of the question. They organized new free States in California and New Mexico. The Mormons also framed a government in Utah. Congress, after a bewildering excitement, determined the matter by another compromise. It admitted California a free State, dismembered New Mexico, transferring a large district free from Slavery to Texas, whose laws carried Slavery over it, and subjected the residue to a Territorial Government, as it also subjected Utah, and stipulated that the future States to be organized in those Territories should be admitted either as free States or as slave States, as they should elect. I pass over the portions of this arrangement which did not bear directly on the point in conflict. The Federal Government presented this compromise to the people, as a comprehensive, final, and perpetual adjustment of all then existing and future questions having any relation to the subject of slavery within the Territories or elsewhere. The country accepted it with that proverbial facility which free States practice, when time brings on a stern conflict which popular passions provoke, and at a distance defy. This halcyon peace, however, had not ceased to be celebrated, and labor required an opening of the region in the old province of Louisiana north of 36 deg. 30 min. which had been reserved in 1820, and dedicated to free labor and free States. The old question was revived in regard to that Territory, and took the narrow name of the Kansas question, just as the stream which Lake Superior discharges, now contracting itself into rivers, and precipitating itself down rapids and cataracts, and now spreading out its waters into broad seas, assumes a new name with every change of form, but continues, nevertheless, the same majestic and irresistible flood under every change, increasing in depth and in volume until it loses itself in the all-absorbing ocean.

No one had ever said, or even thought, that the law of Freedom in this region could be repealed, impaired or evaded. Its constitutionality had indeed been questioned at the time of its enactment; but this, with all other objections, had been surrendered as part of the compromise. It was regarded as bearing the sanction of the public faith, as it certainly had those of time and acquiescence. But the slaveholding people of Missouri looked across the boarder, into Kansas, and coveted the land. The slave States

could not fail to sympathize with them. It seemed as if no organization of Government could be effected in the Territory. The Senator from Illinois, (Mr. Douglas) projected a scheme. Under his vigorous leading, Congress created two Territories—Nebraska and Kansas. The former (the more Northern one) might, it was supposed, be settled without Slavery, and become a free State, or several free States. The latter (the Southern one) was accessible to the slave States, bordered on one of them, and was regarded as containing a region inviting to Slaveholders. So it might be settled by them, and become one or more slave States. Thus, indirectly, a further compromise might be effected, if the Missouri prohibition of 1820 should be abrogated. Congress abrogated it, with the special and effective co-operation of the President, and thus the National Government indirectly intervened in favor of Slave Labor. Loud remonstrances against the measure, on the ground of its violation of the national faith, were silenced by clamorous avowals of a discovery that Congress had never had any right to intervene in the Territories for or against Slavery, but that the citizens of the United States residing within a Territory had, like the people of every State, exclusive authority and jurisdiction over Slavery, as one of the domestic relations. The Kansas-Nebraska act only recognized and affirmed this right, as it was said. The theory was not indeed new, but a vagrant one, which had for some time gone about seeking among political parties the charity of adoption, under the name of Squatter Sovereignty. It was now brought to the front, and baptized with the more attractive appellation of Popular Sovereignty. It was idle for a time to say that under the Missouri prohibition, freemen in the Territory had all the rights which freemen could desire—perfect freedom to do everything but establish Slavery. Popular Sovereignty offered the indulgence of a taste of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of evil as well as of good—a more perfect freedom. Insomuch as the proposition seemed to come from a Free State, the Slave States could not resist its seductions, although sagacious men saw that they were delusive. Consequently, a small and ineffectual stream of slave labor was at once forced into Kansas, engineered by a large number of politicians, advocates at once of Slavery and of the Federal Administration, who proceeded with great haste to prepare the means so to carry the first elections as to obtain the laws necessary for the protection of Slavery. It is one thing, however, to expunge statutes from a national code, and quite another to subvert a national institution, even though it be only a monument of Freedom located in the desert. Nebraska was resigned to Free Labor without a struggle, and Kansas became a theatre of the first actual national conflict between Slave-holding and Free-labor immigrants, met face to face, to organize, through the machinery of Republican action, a civil community.

The parties differed as widely in their appointments, conduct and bearing, as their principles. The free laborers came into the Territory with money, horses, cattle, implements, and engines; with energies concentrated by associations and strengthened by the recognition of some of the States. They marked out farms, and sites for mills, towns, and cities, and proceeded at once to build, to plough, and to sow. They proposed to debate, to discuss, to organize peacefully, and to vote, and to abide the canvass. The Slave-labor party entered the Territory irregularly, staked out possessions, marked them, and then, in most instances, withdrew to the States from which they had come, to sell their new acquisitions, or to return and resume them, as circumstances should render one course or the other expedient. They left armed men in the Territory to watch and guard, and to

summon external aid, either to vote or to fight, as should be found necessary. They were fortified by the favor of the Administration, and so assumed to act with its authority, Intolerant of debate, and defiant, they hurried on the elections which were to be so perverted, that an usurpation should be established. They rang out their summons when the appointed time came, and armed bands of partizans, from States near and remote, invaded and entered the Territory, with banners, ammunition, provisions, and forage, and encamped around the polls. They seized the ballot boxes, replaced the judges of election with partizans of their own, drove away their opponents, filled the boxes with as many votes as the exigencies demanded, and, leaving the results to be returned by reliable hands, they marched back again to their distant homes, to celebrate the conquest, and exult in the prospect of the establishment of Slavery upon the soil so long consecrated to Freedom. Thus, in a single day, they became parents of a State without affection for it, and childless again without bereavement. In this first hour of trial, the new system of popular sovereignty signally failed—failed because it is impossible to organize, by one single act, in one day, a community perfectly free, perfectly sovereign, and perfectly constituted, out of elements unassimilated, unarranged, and uncomposed. Free labor rightfully won the day. Slave labor wrested the victory to itself by fraud and violence. Instead of free Republican Government in the Territory, such as popular sovereignty had promised, there was then and henceforth a hateful usurpation. This usurpation proceeded without delay and without compunction to disfranchise the people. It transferred the slave code of Missouri to Kansas, without stopping in all cases to substitute the name of the Territory for that of the old State. It practically suspended popular elections for three years, the usurping Legislature assigning that term for its own members, while it committed all subordinate trusts to agents appointed by itself. It barred the courts and the juries to its adversaries by test oaths; one made it a crime to think what one pleased, and to write and print what one thought. It borrowed all the enginery of tyranny, but the torture, from the practice of the Stuarts. The party of free labor appealed to the Governor (Reeder) to correct the false election returns. He intervened, but ineffectually, and yet even for that intervention was denounced by the Administration organs, and, after long and unacceptable explanations, he was removed from office by the President. The new Governor (Shannon) sustained for a while the usurpation, but failed to effect the subjugation of the people, although he organized as a militia an armed partizan band of adventurers who had intruded themselves into the Territory to force Slavery upon the people. With the active co-operation of this band, the party of slave labor disarmed the Free State emigrants who had now learned the necessity of being prepared for self-defence, on the borders of the Territory, and on the distant roads and rivers which led into it. They destroyed a bridge that free labor men used in their way to the seat of Government, sacked a hotel where they lodged, and broke up and cast into the river a press which was the organ of their cause.

The people of Kansas, thus deprived, not merely of self-government, but even of peace, tranquility and security, fell back on the unalienable revolutionary right of voluntary reorganization. They determined, however, with admirable temper, judgment and loyalty, to conduct their proceedings for this purpose in deference and subordination to the authority of the Federal Union, and according to the line of safe precedents.

After due elections, open to all the inhabitants of the Territory, they or-

ganized provisionally a State Government at Topeka; and by the hands of a provisional Senator and a provisional Representative, they submitted their Constitution to Congress, and prayed to be admitted as a Free State into the Federal Union. The Federal authorities lent no aid to this movement, but, on the contrary, the President and Senate contemptuously rejected it, and denounced it as a treason, and all its actors and abettors as disloyal to the Union. An army was despatched to the Territory, intended indeed to preserve peace, but at the same to obey and sustain the usurpation. The provisional Legislature, which had met to confer, and to adopt further means to urge the prayers of the people upon Congress, were dispersed by the army, and the State officers provisionally elected, who had committed no criminal act, were arrested, indicted, and held in the Federal camp as State prisoners. Nevertheless, the people of Kansas did not acquiesce. The usurpation remained a barren authority, defied, derided, and despised.

A national election was now approaching. Excitement within and sympathies without the Territory must be allayed. Governor Shannon was removed, and Mr. Geary was appointed his successor. He exacted submission to the statutes of the usurpation, but promised equality in their administration. He induced a repeal of some of these statutes which were obviously unconstitutional, and declared amnesty for political offences. He persuaded the Legislature of the usurpation to ordain a call for a Convention at Lecompton, to form a Constitution, if the measure should be approved by a popular vote, at an election to be held for that purpose. To vote at such an election was to recognize and tolerate the usurpation, as well as to submit to disfranchising laws, and to hazard a renewal of the frauds and violence by which the usurpation had been established. On no account would the Legislature agree that the projected Constitution should be submitted to the people, after it should have been perfected by the Convention. The refusal of this just measure, so necessary to the public security in case of surprise and fraud, was a confession of the purpose on the part of the usurpation to carry a Constitution into effect by surprise and fraud. The Governor insisted on this provision, and demanded of the President of the United States the removal of a partial and tyrannical judge. He failed to gain either measure, and incurred the displeasure of the usurpation by seeking them. He fled the Territory. The Free State party stood aloof from the polls, and a canvass showed that some 2,300 less than a third of the people of the Territory had sanctioned the call of a Convention, while the presence of the army alone held the Territory under a forced truce.

At this juncture the new Federal Administration came in, under a President who had obtained success by the intervention at the polls of a third party—an ephemeral organization, built upon a foreign and frivolous issue, which had just strength enough and life enough to give to a pro-Slavery party the aid required to produce that untoward result. The new President, under a show of moderation, marked a more effectual intervention than that of his predecessors, in favor of Slave labor and a Slave State. Before coming into office, he approached or was approached by the Supreme Court of the United States. On their docket was, through some chance or design, an action which some obscure negro man in Missouri had brought for his freedom against his reputed master. The Court had arrived at the conclusion, on solemn argument, that inasmuch as this unfortunate negro had, through some ignorance or chicane in special pleading, admitted what could not have been proven, that he had descended from some African

who had once been held in bondage, that therefore he was not, in view of the Constitution, a citizen of the United States, and therefore could not implead the reputed master in the Federal Courts; and on this ground the Supreme Court were prepared to dismiss the action, for want of jurisdiction over the suitor's person. This decision, certainly as repugnant to the Declaration of Independence and to the Constitution, as to the instincts of humanity, nevertheless would be one which would exhaust all the power of the tribunal, and exclude considerations of all other questions that had been raised upon the record. The counsel who had appeared for the negro, had volunteered from motives of charity, and ignorant, of course, of the disposition which was to be made of the cause, had argued that his client had been freed from slavery by operation of the Missouri prohibition of 1820. The opposing counsel, paid by the defending slaveholder, had insisted, in reply, that that famous statute was unconstitutional. The mock debate had been heard in the chamber of the Court, in the basement of the Capitol, in the presence of the curious visitors at the seat of Government, whom the dullness of a judicial investigation could not disgust. The Court did not fail to please the incoming President, by seizing this extraneous and idle forensic discussion, and converting it into an occasion for pronouncing an opinion that the Missouri prohibition was void, and that, by force of the Constitution, slavery existed, with all the elements of property in man over man, in all the Territories of the United States, paramount to any popular sovereignty within the Territories, and even to the authority of Congress itself.

In this ill-omened act, the Supreme Court forgot its own dignity, which had always been maintained with just judicial jealousy. They forgot that the province of a court is simply "*jus dicere*," and not at all "*jus dare*." They forgot also that "one foul sentence does more harm than many foul examples; for the last do but corrupt the stream, while the former corrupteth the fountain." And they and the President alike forgot, that judicial usurpation is more odious and intolerable than any other among the manifold practices of tyranny.

The day of Inauguration came—the first one among all the celebrations of that great national pageant that was to be desecrated by a coalition between the Executive and Judicial departments, to undermine the National Legislature and the liberties of the people. The President, attended by the usual lengthened procession, attended, and took his seat on the portico. The Supreme Court attended him there, in robes which yet exacted public reverence. The people, unaware of the import of the whisperings carried on between the President and the Chief Justice, and imbued with veneration for both, filled the avenues and gardens far away as the eye could reach. The President addressed them in words as bland as those which the worst of all the Roman Emperors pronounced when he assumed the purple. He announced (vaguely, indeed, but with self-satisfaction,) the forthcoming extra-judicial exposition of the Constitution, and pledged his submission to it as authoritative and final. The Chief Justice and his Associates remained silent. The Senate, too, were there—constitutional witnesses of the transfer of the Administration. They, too, were silent, although the promised usurpation was to subvert the authority over more than half of the empire which Congress had assumed contemporaneously with the birth of the nation, and had exercised without interruption for nearly seventy years. It cost the President, under the circumstances, little exercise of magnanimity now to promise to the people of Kansas, on whose neck he

had, with the aid of the Supreme Court, hung the millstone of Slavery, a fair trial in their attempt to cast it off, and hurl it to the earth, when they should come to organize a State Government. Alas! that even this cheap promise, uttered under such great solemnities, was only made to be broken!

The pageant ended. On the 5th of March, the Judges without even exchanging their silken robes for courtiers' gowns, paid their salutations to the President in the Executive Palace. Doubtlessly the President received them as graciously as Charles the First did the Judges, who at his instance subverted the statutes of English Liberty. On the 6th of March, the Supreme Court dismissed the new suitor, Dred Scott, to return to his bondage; and having thus disposed of that private action for an alleged private wrong, on the ground of want of jurisdiction in the case, they proceeded with amusing solemnity to pronounce the opinion that if they had had such jurisdiction, still the unfortunate negro would have to remain in bondage, unrelieved, because the Missouri prohibition violates rights of general property involved in Slavery, paramount to the authority of Congress. A few days later, copies of this opinion were multiplied by the Senate's press, and scattered in the name of the Senate broadcast over the land, and their publication has not yet been disowned by the Senate. Simultaneously, Dred Scott, who had played the hand of *dummy* in this interesting political game, unwittingly, yet to the complete satisfaction of his adversary, was voluntarily emancipated; and thus received from his master, as a reward, the freedom which the Court had denied him as a right.

The new President of the United States, having organized this formidable judicial battery at the Capitol, was now ready to begin his active demonstrations of intervention in the Territory. Here occurred not a new want, but an old one revived—a Governor for Kansas. Robert J. Walker born and reared in Pennsylvania, a free State, but long a resident of Mississippi, a slave State, eminent for talent and industry, devoted to the President and his party, plausible and persevering, untiring and efficient, seemed just the man to conduct the fraudulent inchoate proceedings of the projected Lecompton Convention to a conclusion, by dividing the friends of free labor in the Territory, or by casting upon them the responsibility of defeating their own favorite policy by impracticability and contumacy. He wanted for this purpose only an army and full command of the Executive exchequer of promises of favor and of threats of punishment. Frederick P. Stanton, of Tennessee, honorable and capable, of persuasive address, but honest ambition, was appointed his Secretary. The new agents soon found they had assumed a task that would tax all their energies and require all their adroitness. On the one side, the Slave Labor party were determined to circumvent the people, and secure, through the Lecompton Convention, a Slave State. On the other, the people were watchful and determined not to be circumvented, and in no case to submit. Elections for delegates to that body were at hand. The Legislature had required a census and registry of voters to be made by authorities designated by itself, and this duty had been only partially performed in fifteen of the thirty-four counties, and altogether omitted in the other nineteen. The party of Slave Labor insisted on payment of taxes as a condition of suffrage. The Free Labor party deemed the whole proceeding void, by reason of the usurpation practiced, and of the defective arrangements for the election. They discovered a design to surprise in the refusal of any guaranty that the Constitution, when framed, should be submitted to the people, for their acceptance or rejection, preparatory to an application under it for the admission

of Kansas into the Union. The Governor, drawing from the ample treasury of the Executive at his command, made due exhibitions of the army, and threatened the people with an acceptance of the Lecompton Constitution, however obnoxious to them, if they should refuse to vote. With these menaces, he judiciously mingled promises of fabulous quantities of land for the endowment of roads and education. He dispensed with the test oaths and taxes, lamented the defects of census and registry, and promised the rejection of the Constitution, by himself, by the President, and by Congress, if a full, fair and complete submission of the Constitution should not be made by the Convention; and he obtained and published pledges of such submission by the party conventions which nominated the candidates for delegates, and even by an imposing number of those candidates themselves. The people stood aloof, and refused to vote. The army protected the polls. The Slave Labor party alone voted, and voted without legal restraint, and so achieved an easy formal success by casting some two thousand ballots.

Just in the conjuncture, however, the term of three years service which the usurping Legislature had fixed for its own members expired, and elections authorized by itself were to be held, for the choice, not only of new members, but of a delegate to Congress. While the Lecompton Convention was assembling, the Free Labor party determined to attend these Territorial elections, and contest, through them, for self-government within the Territory. They put candidates in nomination, on the express ground of repudiation of the whole Lecompton proceeding. The Lecompton Convention prudently adjourned to a day beyond the elections. The parties contended at the ballot boxes, and the result was a complete and conclusive triumph of the Free Labor party. For a moment this victory, so important, was jeopardized by the fraudulent representation of spurious and fabricated returns of elections in almost uninhabited districts, sufficient to transfer the triumph to the Slave Labor party, and the Free State party was proceeding to vindicate it by force. The Governor and Secretary detected, proved, and exposed, this atrocious fraud. The Lecompton Convention denounced them, and complaints against them poured in upon the President, from the Slave-holding States. They were doomed from that time. The President was silent. The Lecompton Convention proceeded, and framed a Constitution which declares Slavery perpetual and irreversible, and postpones any alteration of its own provisions until after 1864, by which time they hoped that Slavery might have gained too deep a hold in the soil of Kansas to be in danger of being uprooted. All this was easy; but now came the question whether the Constitution should be submitted to the people. It was confessed that it was obnoxious to them, and, if submitted, would be rejected with indignation and contempt. An official emissary from Washington is supposed to have suggested the solution which was adopted. This was a submission in form, but not in fact. The President of the Convention, without any laws to preserve the purity of the franchise by penalties for its violation, was authorized to designate his own agents, altogether irrespectively of the Territorial authorities, and with their aid to hold an election, in which there should be no vote allowed or received, if against the Constitution itself. Each voter was permitted to cast a ballot "for the Constitution with Slavery," or "for the Constitution with no Slavery," and it was further provided, that the Constitution should stand entire, if a majority of votes should be cast for the Constitution with Slavery; while, on the other hand, if the majority of the votes cast should be

"for the Constitution with no Slavery," then the existing Slavery should not be disturbed, but should remain with its continuance, by the succession of its unhappy victims by descent forever. But even this miserable shadow of choice between forms of a Slave State Constitution, was made to depend on the taking of a test oath to support and maintain it in the form which should be preferred by the majority of those who should vote on complying with that humiliation. The Governor saw, that by conniving at this pitiful and wicked juggle he should both shipwreck his fame and become responsible for civil war. He remonstrated, and appealed to his chief, the President of the United States, to condemn it. Denunciations followed him from the Lecompton party within the Territory, and the denunciations no less violent from the Slave States were his greeting at the National Capitol. The President disappointed his most effective friend and wisest counsellor. This present Congress had now assembled. The President, as if fearful of delay, forestalled our attention with recommendations to overlook the manifest objections to the transaction, and to regard the anticipated result of this mock election then not yet held, as equivalent to an acceptance of the Constitution by the people of Kansas, alleging that the refusal of the people to vote either the ballot for the "Constitution with Slavery," or the false and deceitful ballot for the "Constitution with no Slavery," would justly be regarded as drawing after it the consequences of actual acceptance and an adoption of the Constitution itself. His argument was apologetic, as it lamented that the Constitution had not been fairly submitted; and jesuitical, as it urged that the people might, when once admitted as a State, change the Constitution at their pleasure, in defiance of the provision which postpones any change seven years.

Copies of the message containing these arguments were transmitted to the Territory, to confound and dishearten the Free State party, and obtain a surrender, at the election to be held on the 21st of December, on the question submitted by the Convention. The people, however, were neither misled nor intimidated. Alarmed by this act of connivance by the President of the United States with their oppressors, they began to prepare for the last arbitrament of nations. The Secretary, Mr. Stanton, now Governor *ad interim*, issued his proclamation, calling the new Territorial Legislature to assemble to provide for preserving the public peace. An Executive spy dispatched information of this proceeding to the President by telegraph, and instantly Mr. Stanton ceased to be Secretary and Governor *ad interim*, being removed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States. Thus the services of Frederick P. Stanton came to an abrupt end, but in a manner most honorable to himself. His chief, Mr. Walker, was less wise and less fortunate. He resigned. Pætus Thræsea (we are informed by Tacitus) had been often present in the Senate, when the fathers descended to unworthy acts, and did not rise in opposition; but on the occasion when Nero procured for them a decree to celebrate, as a festival, the day on which he had murdered his mother, Agrippina, Pætus left his seat and walked out of the chamber—thus by his virtue provoking future vengeance, and yet doing no service to the cause of Liberty. Possibly Robert J. Walker may find a less stern historian.

The new Secretary, Mr. Denver, became Governor of Kansas, the fifth incumbent of that office appointed within less than four years, the legal term of one. Happily, however, for the honor of the country, three of the recalls were made on the ground of the virtue of the parties disgraced. The Pro-Consuls of the Roman provinces were brought back to the Capitol to answer for their crimes.

The proceedings which the late Secretary Stanton had so wisely instituted, nevertheless, went on; and it has become, as I trust, the principal means of rescuing from tyranny the people whom he governed so briefly and yet so well. The Lecompton Constitution had directed that on the 4th of January, election should be held to fill the State offices and the offices of members of the Legislature and member of Congress, to assume their trusts when the new State should be admitted into the Union. The Legislature of the Territory now enacted salutary laws for preserving the purity of elections in all cases. It directed the Lecompton Constitution to be submitted to a fair vote on that day, the ballots being made to express a consent to the Constitution, or a rejection of it, with or without Slavery. The Free Labor party debated anxiously on the question, whether, besides voting against the Constitution, they should, under protest, vote also for officers to assume the trust created by it, if Congress should admit the State under it. After a majority had decided that no such votes should be cast, a minority hastily rejected the decision, and nominated candidates for those places, to be supported under protest. The success of the movement, made under the most serious disadvantages, is conclusive evidence of their strength. While the election held on the 21st of December, allowing all fraudulent votes, showed some six thousand majority for the Constitution with slavery, and some five hundred votes for the Constitution without slavery, the election on the 4th of January showed an aggregate majority of eleven thousand against the Constitution itself in any form, with the choice, under protest, of a Representative in Congress, and a large majority of all the candidates nominated by the Free Labor party for the various Executive and Legislative trusts, under the Lecompton Constitution.

The Territorial Legislature has abolished Slavery by a law to take effect in March, 1858, though the Lecompton Constitution contains provisions anticipating and designed to defeat this great act of justice and humanity. It has organized a militia, which stands ready for the defence of the rights of the people against any power. The President of the Convention has fled the Territory, charged with an attempt to procure fraudulent returns to reverse the already declared results of the last election, and he holds the public in suspense as to his success until after his arrival at the Capitol, and the decision of Congress on the acceptance of the Lecompton Constitution. In the meantime, the Territorial Legislature has called a Convention, subject to the popular approval, to be held this month, and to form a Constitution to be submitted to the people, and, when adopted, to be the organic law of the new State of Kansas, subject to her admission into the Union. The President of the United States, having received the Lecompton Constitution, has submitted it to Congress, and insisting that the vote taken on the juggle of the Lecompton Convention, held on the 21st of December, is legally conclusive of its acceptance by the people, and absolute against the fair, direct and unimpeachable rejection of it by that people, made on the 4th of January last; he recommends, and urges and implores the admission of Kansas as a State into the Federal Union, under that false, pretended and spurious Constitution. I refrain from an examination of this extraordinary message. My recital is less complete than I have hoped, if it does not overthrow all the President's arguments in favor of the acceptance of the Lecompton Constitution as an act of the people of Kansas, however specious, and without descending to any details. In Congress, those who seek the admission of Kansas under the Constitution, strive to delay the admission of Minnesota, until their opponents shall compromise on that paramount question.

This, Mr. President, is a concise account of the national intervention in the Territories in favor of slave labor and Slave States since 1820. No wonder that the question before us excites apprehensions and alarms. There is at last a North side of this Chamber, a North side of the Chamber of Representatives, a North side of the Union, as well as South sides of all these. Each of them is watchful, jealous and resolute. If it be true, as has often been asserted, that this Union cannot survive the decision by Congress of a direct question involving the adoption of a Free State which will establish the ascendancy of Free States under the Constitution, and draw after it the restoration of the influence of Freedom, in the domestic and foreign conduct of the Government, then the day of dissolution is at hand.

I have thus, Mr. President, arrived at the third circumstance attending the Kansas question which I have thought worthy of consideration, namely, that the national intervention in the Territories in favor of slave labor and Slave States is opposed to the material, moral and social developments of the Republic. The proposition seems to involve a paradox, but it is easy to understand that the checks which the Constitution applies, through prudent caution, to the relative increase of the representation of the Free States in the House of Representatives, and especially in the Senate, co-operating with the differences of temper and political activity between the two classes of States, may direct the Government of the Federal Union in one course, while the tendencies of the nation itself, popularly regarded, are in a direction exactly opposite.

The ease and success which attended the earlier policy of intervention in favor of free labor and free States, and the resistance which the converse policy of intervention in favor of slave labor and slave States encounters, sufficiently establish the existence of the antagonism between the Government and the nation which I have asserted. A vessel moves quietly and peacefully while it descends with the current. You mark its way by the foam on its track only when it is forced against the tide. I will not dwell on other proofs—such as the more rapid growth of the Free States, the ruptures of ecclesiastical Federal Unions and the demoralization of political parties.

Mr. President, I have shown why it is that the Kansas question is attended by difficulties and dangers, only by way of preparation for the submission of my opinion in regard to the manner in which the question ought to be determined and settled. I think, with great deference to the judgment of others, that the expedient, peaceful, and right way to determine it, is to reverse the existing policy of intervention in favor of slave labor and slave States. It would be wise to restore the Missouri prohibition of slavery in Kansas and Nebraska. There was peace in the Territories and in the States, until that great statute of Freedom was subverted. It is true that there were frequent debates here on the subject of Slavery, and that there were profound sympathies among the people, awakened by or responding to those debates. But what was Congress instituted for but debates? What makes the American people differ from all other nations but this? that, while among them, power enforces silence, here all public questions are referred to debate, free debate in Congress. Do you tell me that the Supreme Court of the United States has removed the foundations of this great statute? I reply, that they have done no such thing; they could not do it. They have remanded the negro man Dred Scott to the custody of his master. With that decree, we have nothing here, at least nothing now, to do. This is the extent of the judgment rendered—the

extent of any judgment they could render. Already, the pretended further decision is subverted in Kansas. So it will be in every free State and in every free Territory in the United States. The Supreme Court, also, can reverse its spurious judgment easier than we could reconcile the people to its usurpation. Sir, the Supreme Court of the United States attempts to command the people of the United States to accept the principles that one man can own other men, and that they must guaranty the inviolability of that false and pernicious property. The people of the United States never can, and they never will, accept principles so unconstitutional and so abhorrent. Never, never! Let the Court recede. Whether it recede or not, we shall reorganise the Court, and thus reform its political sentiments and practices, and bring them into harmony with the Constitution and with the laws of nature. In doing so, we shall not only re-assume our own just authority, but we shall restore that high tribunal itself to the position it ought to maintain, since so many inalienable rights of citizens, and even of States themselves, depend upon its impartiality and its wisdom.

Do you tell me that the Slave States will not acquiesce, but will agitate? Think first whether the Free States will acquiesce in a decision that shall not only be unjust, but fraudulent. True, they will not menace the Republic. They have an easy and simple remedy, namely, to take the Government out of unjust and faithless hands, and commit it to those who will be just and faithful. They are ready to do this now. They want only a little more harmony of purpose and a little more completeness of organization. These will result from only the least addition to the pressure of Slavery upon them. You are lending all that is necessary, and even more, in this very act. But will the Slave States agitate? Why? Because they have lost at last a battle that they could not win, unwisely provoked, fought with all the advantages of strategy and intervention, and on a field chosen by themselves. What would they gain? Can they compel Kansas to adopt Slavery against her will? Would it be reasonable or just to do it, if they could? Was negro servitude ever forced by the sword on any people that inherited the blood which circulates in our veins, and the sentiments which make us a free people? If they will agitate on such a ground as this, then how or when, by what concession we can make, will they ever be satisfied? To what end would they agitate? It can now be only to divide the Union. Will they not need some farther and more plausible excuse for a proposition so desperate? How would they improve their condition, by drawing down a certain ruin upon themselves? Would they gain any new security for Slavery? Would they not hazard securities that are invaluable? Sir, they who talk so wildly, talk what they do not know themselves. No man when cool can promise what he will do when he shall be inflamed; no man inflamed can speak for his actions when time and necessity shall bring reflection. Much less can any one speak for States in such emergencies.

But I shall not insist now, on so radical a measure as the restoration of the Missouri prohibition. I know how difficult it is for power to relinquish even a pernicious and suicidal policy all at once. We may attain the same result in this particular case of Kansas, without going back so far. Go back only to the ground assumed in 1854, the ground of Popular Sovereignty. Happily for the authors of that measure, the zealous and energetic resistance of abuses practised under it has so far been effected that Popular Sovereignty in Kansas may now be made a fact, and Liberty there may be rescued from danger through its free exercise. Popular Sovereignty

is an epic of two parts. Part the first, presents Freedom in Kansas lost. Part the second, if you will so consent to write it, shall be Freedom in Kansas regained. It is on this ground that I hail the eminent Senator from Illinois, (Mr. Douglas) and his associates, the distinguished Senator from Michigan, (Mr. Stuart) and the youthful but most brave Senator from California, (Mr. Broderick.) The late Mr. Clay told us that Providence has many ways for saving nations. God forbid that I should consent to see Freedom wounded, because my own lead or even my own agency in saving it should be rejected, I will cheerfully co-operate with these new defenders of this sacred cause in Kansas, and I will award them all due praise, when we shall have been successful, for their large share of merit in its deliverance.

Will you tell me that it is difficult to induce the Senate and the House of Representatives to take that short backward step? On the contrary, the hardest task that an executive dictator ever set, or parliamentary manager ever undertook, is to prevent this very step from being taken. Let the President take off his hand, and the bow bent so long, and held to its tension by so hard a pressure, will relax, and straighten itself at once.

Consider now, if you please, the consequences of your refusal. If you attempt to coerce Kansas into the Union, under the Lecompton Constitution, the people of that Territory will resort to civil war. You are pledged to put down that revolution by the sword. Will the people listen to your voice amid the thunders of your cannon? Let but one drop of the blood of a free citizen be shed by the Federal army, and the countenance of every representative of a Free State, in either House of Congress, will blanch, and his tongue will refuse to utter the vote necessary to sustain the army in the butchery of his fellow-citizens.

Practically, you have already one intestine and Territorial war. A war against Brigham Young in Utah. Can you carry on two and confine the strife within the Territories. Can you win both? A wise nation will never provoke more than one ration at one time. I know that you argue that the Free State men of Kansas are impracticable, factious, seditious. Answer me three questions: Are they not a majority, and so proclaimed by the people of Kansas? Is not this quarrel for the right of governing themselves conceded by the Federal Constitution! Is the tyranny of forcing a hateful government upon them less intolerable than three cents impost on a pound of tea, or five cents stamp duty on a promissory note? You may say that they can change this Lecompton Constitution when it shall once have been forced upon them. Let it be abandoned now. What guaranty can you give against your own intervention to prevent that future change? What security can you give for your own adherence to the construction of the Constitution which you adopt, from expediency, to-day? What better is a Constitution than a by-law of a corporation, if it may be forced on a State to-day, and rejected to-morrow, in derogation of its own express inhibition.

I perceive, Mr. President, that in the way of argument, I have passed already from the ground of expediency, on which I was standing, to that of right and justice. Among all our refinements of constitutional learning, one principle, one fundamental principle, has been faithfully preserved, namely: That the new States must come voluntarily into the Union; they must not be forced into it. "Unite or die," was the motto addressed to the States in the time of the Revolution. Though Kansas should perish, she cannot be brought into the Union by force.

So long as the States shall come in by free consent, their admission will be an act of union, and this will be a confederacy. Whenever they shall be brought in by fraud or force, their admission will be an act of consolidation, and the nation, ceasing to be a Confederacy, will become in reality an Empire. All our elementary instruction is wrong, or else this change of the Constitution will subvert the liberties of the American people.

You argue the consent of Kansas from documentary proofs of her forced and partial acquiescence, under your tyrannical rule, from the elections fraudulently conducted, from her own contumacy and from your own records, made up here against her. I answer the whole argument at once: Kansas protests here, and stands, by your own confession, in an attitude of rebellion at home, to resist the annexation which you contend she is soliciting at your hands.

Sir, if your proofs were a thousand times stronger, I would not hold the people of Kansas bound by them. They are all contradicted by stern facts. A people can be bound by no action conducted in their name, and pretending to their sanction, unless they enjoy perfect freedom and safety in giving that consent. You have held the people of Kansas in duress from the first hour of their attempted organization as a community. To crown this duress by an act, at once forcing slavery on them, which they hate, and them into a union with you, on terms which they abhor, would be but to illustrate anew, and on a grand scale, the maxim—

"Prosperum et felix scelus, virtutes vocatur."

Mr. President, it is an occasion for joy and triumph when a community that has gathered itself together under circumstances of privation and exile, and proceed through a season of territorial or provincial dependence or distant central authority, becomes a State, in the full enjoyment of civil and religious liberty, and rise into the dignity of a member of this imperial Union. But in the case of Kansas, her whole existence has been, and it yet is, a trial, a tempest, a chaos—and now you propose to make her nuptials a celebration of the funeral of her freedom. The people of Kansas are entitled to have that freedom, for they have won it back when it had been wrested from them by invasion and usurpation. Sir, you are great and strong. On this occasion there is no power can resist you. On any other there is hardly a power that would not reluctantly engage with you; but you can never, never conquer Kansas. Your power, like a throne which is built of pine boards, and covered with purple, is weakness, except it be defended by a people confiding in you, because satisfied that you are just, and grateful for the freedom that, under you, they enjoy.

Sir, in view, once more, of this subject of slavery, I submit that our own dignity requires that we shall give over this champerty with slaveholders, which we practice in prescribing acquiescence in their rule as a condition of toleration of self government in the territories. We are defeated in it. We may wisely give it up, and admit Kansas as a Free State, since she will consent to be admitted only in that character.

Mr. President, if I could at all suppose it desirable or expedient to enlarge the field of slave labor, and of slaveholding sway in this republic, I should nevertheless maintain that it is wise to relinquish the effort to sustain slavery in Kansas. The question, in regard to that territory, has risen from a private one about slavery as a domestic institution, to one of slavery as a national policy. At every step, you have been failing. Will you go on still further, ever confident, and yet ever unsuccessful?

I believe sir, to some extent, in the isothermal theory. I think there are regions, beginning at the North pole, and stretching southward, where slavery will die out soon, if it be planted; and I know, too well, that in the tropics, and to some extent northward of them, slavery lives long, and is hard to extirpate. But I cannot find a certain boundary. I am sure, however, that 36 deg. 30 min. is the far north. I think it is a moveable boundary, and that every year it advances towards a more southern parallel.

But is there just now a real want of a new State for the employment of slave labor? I see and feel the need of room for a new State to be assigned to free labor, of room for such a new State almost every year. I think I see how it arises. Free white men abound in this country, and in Europe, and even in Asia. Economically speaking, their labor is cheap—there is a surplus of it. Under improved conditions of society, life grows longer, and multiply faster. Wars, which sometimes wastes them, grow less frequent and less destructive. Invention is continually producing machines and engines, artificial laborers, crowding them from one field of industry to another—ever more from the eastern regions of this continent to the West—ever more from the overcrowded eastern continent to the prairies and the wildernesses in our own. But I do not see any such overflowing of the African slave population in this country, even where it is unresisted. Free labor has been obstructed in Kansas. There are, nevertheless, 50,000 or 60,000 freemen gathered there already—gathered there within four years. Slave labor has been free to importation. There are only 100 to 200 slaves there. To settle and occupy a new slave State anywhere, is *pari passu*, to depopulate old slave States. Whence, then, are the supplies of slaves to come, and how? Only by reviving the African slave trade. But this is forbidden. Visionaries dream that the prohibition can be repealed. The idea is insane. A republic of thirty millions of freemen, with a free white laboring population so dense as already to crowd on subsistence, to be brought to import negroes from Africa to supplant them as cultivators, and so subject themselves to starvation! Though Africa is yet unorganized, and unable to protect itself, still it has already exchanged, in a large degree, its wars to make slaves, and its commerce in slaves, for legitimate agriculture and trade. All European states are interested in the civilization of that continent, and they will not consent that we shall arrest it. The Christian church cannot be forced back two centuries, and be made to sanction the African slave trade as a missionary enterprise.

Every nation has always some ruling idea, which, however, changes with the several stages of its development. A ruling idea of the colonies on this continent two hundred years ago, was labor to subdue and reclaim nature. Then African labor was seized and employed as an auxiliary, under a seeming necessity. That idea has ceased forever. It has given place to a new one. Aggrandizement of the nation, not indeed as it once was, to make a small state great, but to make a state already great the greatest of all states. It still demands labor, but it is no longer the ignorant labor of barbarians, but labor perfected by knowledge, and skill and combination, with all the scientific principles of mechanism. It demands, not the labor of slaves, which needs to be watched and defended, but voluntary, enlightened labor, stimulated by interest, affection and ambition. It needs that every man shall own the land he tills; that every head shall be fit for the helmet, and every hand fit for the sword, and every mind ready and quali-

fied for counsel. To attempt to aggrandize a country with slaves for its inhabitants, would be to try to make a large body of empire with feeble sinews and empty veins.

Mr. President, the expansion of territory to make Slave States will only fail to be a greater crime, because it is impracticable, and therefore will turn out to be a stupendous imbecility. A free, Republican Government, like this, notwithstanding all its constitutional checks, cannot long resist and counteract the progress of society. Slavery, wherever and whenever, and in whatsoever form it exists, is exceptional, local, and short-lived. Freedom is the common right, interest, and ultimate destiny of all mankind. All other nations have already abolished, or are about abolishing slavery. Does this mean nothing? All parties in this country that have tolerated the extension of slavery, except one, have perished for that error already. That last one—the Democratic party—is hurrying on irretrievably toward the same fate. All administrations that have avowed this policy have gone down dishonored for that cause, except the present one. A pit deeper and darker is opening to receive this administration, because it sins more deeply than its predecessors. There is a meaning in all these facts, which it becomes us to study well. The nation has advanced another stage; it has reached the point where interventions, by the Government, for Slavery and Slave States, will no longer be tolerated. Free labor has at last apprehended its rights, its interest, its power and its destiny, and is organizing itself to assume the government of the republic. It will henceforth meet you boldly and resolutely here; it will meet you everywhere, in the Territories or out of them, wherever you may go to extend slavery. It has driven you back in California and in Kansas; it will invade you soon in Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Missouri and Texas. It will meet you in Arizona, in Central America, and even in Cuba. The invasion will be not merely harmless but beneficent, if you yield seasonably to its just and moderate demands. It proved so in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and the other Slave States, which have already yielded in that way to its advances. You may, indeed, get a start under or near the tropics, and seem safe for a time, but it will be only a short time. Even there you will find States only for free labor to maintain and occupy. The interest of the white races demands the ultimate emancipation of all men.—Whether this consummation shall be allowed to take effect, with needful and wise precautions against sudden change and disaster, or be hurried on by violence, is all that remains for you to decide. For the failure of your system of slave labor throughout the Republic, the responsibility will rest not on the agitators you condemn, or the political parties you arraign or even altogether on yourselves, but it will be due to the inherent error of the system itself, and to the error which thrusts it forward to oppose and resist the destiny, not more of the African than that of the white races. The white man needs this continent to labor upon. His head is clear, his arm is strong, and his necessities are fixed. He must and will have it. To secure it, he will oblige the Government of the United States to abandon intervention in favor of Slave labor and Slave States, and go backwards forty years, and resume the original policy of intervention in favor of free labor and free States. The fall of the castle of San Juan d'Ulloa determined the fate of Mexico, although sore sieges and severe pitched battles intervened before the capture of the capital of the Aztecs. The defeats you have encountered in California and in Kansas determines the fate of the principle for which you have been contending. It is for your—

self, not for us, to decide how long and through what further mortifications and disasters the contest shall be protracted, before Freedom shall enjoy her already assured triumph. I would have it ended now, and would have the wounds of society bound up and healed. But this can be done only in one way. It cannot be done by offering further resistance, nor by any invasion or partial surrender, nor by forcing Kansas into the Union as a Slave State, against her will, leaving her to cast off slavery afterwards, as she best may; nor by compelling Minnesota and Oregon to wait, and wear the humiliating costume of territories at the doors of Congress, until the people of Kansas, or their true defenders here, shall be brought to dishonorable compromises. It can be done only by the simple and direct admission of the three new States as free States, without qualification, condition, reservation or compromise, and by the abandonment of all further attempts to extend slavery under the Federal Constitution. You have unwisely pushed the controversy so far, that only these broad concessions will now be accepted by the interest of free labor and free States. For myself, I see this fact, perhaps the more distinctly now, because I have so long foreseen it. I can, therefore, counsel nothing less than those concessions. I know the hazards I incur in taking this position. I know how men and parties, now earnest, and zealous and bold, may yet fall away from me as the controversy shall wax warm, and alarms and dangers, now unlooked for, shall stare them in the face; as men and parties equally earnest, bold and zealous, have done in like circumstances before. But it is the same position I took in the case of California, eight years ago. It is the same I maintained on the great occasion of the organization of Kansas and Nebraska, four years ago. Time and added experience have vindicated it since, and I assume it again, to be maintained to the last, with confidence that it will be justified ultimately by the country and by the civilized world. You may refuse to yield it now, and for a short period, but your refusal will only animate the friends of freedom with the courage and the resolution, and produce the union among them which alone is necessary on their part to attain the position itself simultaneously with the impending overthrow of the existing Federal Administration and the constitution, of a new and more independent Congress.

Mr. President, this expansion of the empire of free white men is to be conducted through the progress of admitting new states, and not otherwise. The white man, whether you consent or not, will make the states to be admitted, and he will make them all free states. We must admit them, and admit them all free; otherwise, they will become independent and foreign states, constituting a new empire to contend with us for the continent. To admit them is a simple, easy, and natural policy. It is not new to us, nor to our times. It began with the voluntary union of the first thirteen. It has continued to go on, overriding all resistance ever since. It will go on until the ends of the continent are the borders of our Union. Thus we become co-laborers with our fathers, and even with our posterity throughout many ages. After times, contemplating the whole vast structure, completed and perfected, will forget the dates, and the eras, and the individualities, of the builders in their successive generations. It will be one great republic, founded by one body of benefactors. I wonder that the President of the United States undervalues the Kansas question, when it is a part of a transaction so immense and sublime. Far from sympathizing with him in his desire to depreciate it, and to be rid of it, I felicitate myself on my humble relation to it, for I know that heaven cannot grant, nor

man desire a more favorable occasion to acquire fame, than he enjoys who is engaged in laying the foundation of a great empire; and I know, also, that while mankind have often defied their benefactors, no nation has ever yet bestowed honors on the memories of the founders of slavery.

I have always believed, Mr. President, that this glorious Federal Constitution of ours is adapted to the inevitable expansion of the empire which I have so feebly presented. It has been perverted often by misconstruction, and it is yet to be perverted many times, and widely, hereafter; but it has inherent strength and vigor that will cast off all the webs which the ever-changing interest of classes may weave around it. If it fail us now, it will however, not be our fault, but because an inevitable crisis, like that of youth, or of manhood, to be encountered by a constitution proved in that case to be inadequate to the trial. I am sure that no patriot who views the subject as I do, could wish to evade or delay the trial. By delay we could only extend Slavery, at the most, throughout the Atlantic region of the continents. The Pacific slope is free, and it always must and will be free. The mountain barriers that separates us from that portion of our empire, are quite enough to divide us too widely, possibly to alienate us too soon. Let only these become all Slave-holding States on this side of those barriers, while only Free States are organized and perpetuated on the other side, and then indeed there will come a division of the great American family into two nations, equally ambitious for complete control over the continent, and a conflict between them, over which the world will mourn, as the greatest and last to be retrieved of all the calamities that have ever befallen the human race.

A Virginian on Wm. H. Seward.

The country should look with more anxiety and interest to the course of Wm. H. Seward, than to that of any man living. He is a man of mighty powers of influence, and of vast actual influence. In no unimportant sense he is the representative man of his age. His influence over the Northern mind and control over the Northern modes of thoughts, is almost unbounded. He is regarded by many here as an honest man in the highest sense. He is living for ages to come—not for the present moment. He has a disposition to find, and ground himself on, the right, as he knows that that only will endure forever.

The expression is very common among Republican members here, that the Republican party is destined to become the great National party of the country—that the South will all come into it, when it learns that they do not meditate any interference with the institution as it exists in the States; and the South will relinquish their claim and desire to extend beyond their present limits.—*Clark County (Va.) Advertiser.*

SLAVERY TO BE "BOUGHT OUT" IN KENTUCKY.—The Newport (Ky.) News states that "a proposition is in contemplation to buy the land and negroes owned by slaveholders in Kentucky at their present valuation; and if three-fourths of the slaveholders in the State will agree to sell, the proposed company will advance a sum of money equal to one-half the estimated value of both, and in one year after, pay the whole balance. The slaves will be set free and the lands sold at an advanced price, in view of the State becoming free in one year after the first payment to the masters, and the State become settled with real industrious, enterprising free people."

G R E A T S P E E C H
O F
H O N. F. P. B L A I R, J R.,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JAN. 14, 1858.

HON. FRANCIS P. BLAIR, JR., well known as the Representative in Congress from the Free Soil city of St. Louis, lately astonished the Fire-eaters in the House, by a comprehensive exposition of his policy in regard to Central America; and, incidentally, in regard to the slavery question generally. A portion of his speech, we transfer to our columns, regretting that we have not space for his views entire. It will be seen that Mr. BLAIR favors the acquisition, by peaceable means, of such parts of Central America, as may be necessary for the purpose of colonizing therein the colored population of the United States, now free, and such portions thereof as may be hereafter manumitted. The proposition is a bold one, but eminently characteristic of its author, who has no doubt of its feasibility. As we understand him, he presents it as a solution of the Slavery question, and the Central American question at the same time, and by means which will avoid war, preserve the Union and satisfy slaveholders, philanthropists, the blacks, and the whites—in fact all immediately concerned, and all the civilized world besides. We commend our readers to the careful study of what Mr. BLAIR has said.—*Chicago Daily Tribune, Jan. 27.*

Mr. Blair offered the following resolution:

“Resolved, That a select committee, to consist of—members, be appointed by the speaker, with instructions to inquire into the expediency of providing for the acquisition of territory either in the Central or South American States, to be colonized with colored persons from the United States who are now free, or who may hereafter become free, and who may be willing to settle in such territory, as a dependency of the United States, with ample guarantees of their personal and political rights.”

There is a party in this country who go for the extension of slavery; and those predatory incursions against our neighbors are the means by which territory is to be seized, planted with slavery, annexed to this Union, and in combination with the present slaveholding States, made to dominate this Government, and the entire continent; or, failing in the policy of annexation, to unite with the Slave States in a southern slaveholding Republic. I believe that there are those who entertain such a purpose. I am opposed to the whole scheme, and to every part of it; and, in order to oppose it successfully, I think we should recur to the plans cherished by the great men who founded this Republic. I think we ought to put it out of the power of any body of men to plant slavery anywhere on this continent, by taking immediate steps to give all of these countries that require it, and especially to the Central American States, the power to sustain free institutions under stable Government; and, as one method of doing this, we

might plant those countries with a class of men who are worse than useless to us, who would prove themselves to be of immense advantage to those countries, who would attract the wealth and energy of our best men to aid and direct them in developing the incredible riches of those regions, and thus open them to our commerce, and the commerce of the whole world. I refer to our enfranchised slaves, all of that class who would willingly embrace the offer to form themselves into a colony under the protection of our flag, and the guarantee of the Republic, of every personal and political right necessary to their safety and prosperity.

What I propose is not new; it is bottomed on the reasoning and recommendation of Mr. Jefferson. Speaking of a proposition, similar in many respects, urged by him upon the Legislature of his native State, he says:

"It was, however, found that the public mind would not yet bear the proposition, nor will it bear it even at this day; yet the day is not far distant when it must bear it and adopt it, or worse will follow. Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate, than that these people (the negroes) are to be free; nor is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same Government. Nature, habit, opinion, have drawn indelible lines of distinction between them. It is still in our power to direct the process of EMANCIPATION AND DEPORTATION, and in such slow degree as that the evil will wear off insensibly, and their place be *pari passu* filled up by free white laborers. If, on the contrary, it is left to force itself on, human nature must shudder at the prospect held up. We should in vain look for an example in the Spanish deportation or depletion of the Moors."

The time has ripened for the execution of Mr. Jefferson's plan. By adopting it, we may relieve ourselves of a people who are a burden to us; give to them an amount of happiness and comfort they can never realize here, where they are treated as a degraded class; reinvigorate the feeble people of the Southern Republics, and open up to the enterprise of our merchants the untold wealth of the intertropical region, containing a greater amount of productive land than all the balance of the continent; put a stop to the African slave trade, which is created and kept up by the demand for tropical productions; by supplying that demand by the labor of the only class of freemen capable of exertion in that climate. I make this proposition to meet, oppose, and defeat that which seeks by violence to re-establish slavery; re-open the African slave trade, subject these regions, in Walker's own language, "to military rule," and exclude from them the people of the Northern States. * * * *

John Randolph held the following views in regard to this great evil:

"Sir, I know there are gentlemen, not only from the southern, but the northern States, who think that this unhappy question—for such it is—of negro slavery, which the Constitution has vainly attempted to blink by not using the term, should never be brought into public notice, more especially into that of Congress, and most especially here. Sir, with every due respect for the gentlemen who think so, I differ with them *toto cælo*. Sir, it is a thing which cannot be hid. It is not a dry-rot which you can cover with a carpet until the house tumbles about your ears. You might as well try to hide a volcano in full operation. It cannot be hid; it is a cancer on your face, and must not be tampered with by quacks, who never saw the disease of the patient, and prescribe across the Atlantic. It must be, if you will, let alone."

He then points his conclusion in a way to make it stick in the memories of the masters of slaves, to whom he addressed himself:

"The moment the labor of the slave ceases to be profitable to the master, or very soon after it has reached that stage, if the slave will not run away from the master, the master will run away from the slave."

A cancer on the face, which, unless removed, would eat into the vitals of the Republic, I concur in his opinion, that the master must run away from his slaves, unless they run away from him. Unhappily for the slave States, many of their enterprising young men leave their native land for those States where individual ability and exertion are sufficient to confer wealth and eminence; and all of that oppressed class who are compelled to labor with their naked hands, and struggle for existence in competition with the monopolizing slave power that holds the soil, and bands together, by a common interest, the capital, the intelligence, and influence, of the order controlling the government of the Commonwealth to make it paramount, would also fly, if they had the means of flight, or a spot on earth they could call their own to receive them. Although the time has not yet come when the masters are ready to run away from their slaves, it will doubtless come, if ever that great mass of freemen who feel the weight of the institution pressing them to the earth, should have the means of reaching homesteads in happier regions, where their labor might render them independent. Can any condition be more lamentable for a State than that which makes it the obvious interest of the mass of its free population to abandon it? and if poverty prevents this desertion, the cause of detention, constantly increasing, must in the end grow into a frightful calamity.

Where would the slaves go if they could run away? The North may receive an absconding straggler here and there, but what States would receive five millions of slaves? or how would the runaways be anywhere provided for? The free States which have put an interdict, so far away as remote Oregon, upon the admission of free blacks, even in the stinted number which might come from the limited emancipation permitted in the South, would hardly receive millions upon a general jail delivery. Nor can the masters run away from their slaves, unless the North is ready to become a St. Domingo; nor emancipate them *en masse* without making it a St. Domingo.

Mr. Blair quotes from Randolph's will, wherein he says: "I give and bequeath to my slaves their freedom, heartily regretting that I have ever been the owner of one."

The "gradual abolition," contemplated by Washington, had, before Mr. Jefferson's death, made so large a class of free negroes as to endanger the safety of the white race by inciting formidable insurrections among the slaves, besides producing the lesser inconveniences apprehended. Hence, the law prohibiting manumission without the removal of the emancipated slaves from the State. Mr. Randolph's love for his own State was so great that he set an example of an exodus by sending his tribe of freed blacks beyond the confines of Virginia. By the legislation of many free States the intrusion of such emigration was soon prevented; and it may now be asserted with truth, that the laws of the free and the slave States combine to perpetuate slavery! for where is the freed man to go? A few rich masters provide the means to return their bondsmen to Africa; and recently some small parties embarked to Mexico, to throw themselves upon the humanity of its semi-barbarous people. There is no alternative but to submit to expulsion, or to refuse the boon of freedom. There existed at least half a million manumitted slaves before the proscriptive laws were passed at the North or South. In the latter section, where the intercourse of the enfran-

chised and enslaved of the same race is pregnant with danger, measures are in progress to reduce all to the condition of slavery. Laws have been passed in some of the slave States providing that the freed may subject themselves again to servitude, if they can find a master. During the summer and fall another step was taken in this direction by large meetings in Virginia, praying the legislature to authorize a sweeping sale of all free blacks by auction—to reduce the entire race within the State, however slightly tinctured with negro blood, to bondage.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in the comparative progress of the slave and free States, since the illustrious patriots of Virginia, in the last and most solemn act of their lives, bore their testimony against the institution which now convulses the Confederacy, tending to condemn their policy. There is much in the aspect now given to our affairs by that fatal element, against which their forecast gave warning, to prove that their solicitude to remove it had its root in that sound judgment and devoted love to the country, which made the strongest features of their characters. One great difficulty obstructed these efforts. Emancipation was easy, but the amalgamation of the white and black races was abhorrent, and their existence as equals, under the same Government, was for that reason impossible. They were, nevertheless, resolved to make the experiment of the gradual abolition of slavery, hoping that time would make some outlet to the degraded state. I believe the existing circumstances on this continent now justify that hope. The attempt of African colonization, to relieve us of the load, has failed. The immense distance, and the barbarous state of the mother country, to which we would restore its improved race that has arisen among us, has paralyzed all the efforts of the benevolent society that has labored so long in vain to form a community in Liberia which would draw hence its kindred emancipated population, and establish a nation there to spread civilization and religion over Africa. Time has shown that the causes which have produced races, never to improve Africa, or to be improved there, but to abandon it and give their vigor and derive their advancement in other climes, are not to be reversed by the best efforts of the best men. "Westward the star of empire takes its way," is a prophecy which will find its accomplishment within the tropics as well as outside of them on this continent. Liberty and security promote enterprise and industry, and so create that intelligence which brings in its train civilization and Christianity. Africa is a desert, in which every effort to propagate the elements which lead to such results have proved failures; and for ages Africa has ever been "the house of bondage."

As Americans, it is our first interest to take care of this continent, and provide for the races on whose faculties and labor its advancement depends. In my opinion, the door is now open in Central America to receive the enfranchised colored race born amongst us, and which has received, with our language and the habits contracted under our institutions, much that adapts it to sustain a part in giving stability to the institutions copied from ours in the Central American. * * * *

Our Presidents, of late years, have not been able to lift their vision to look beyond a President-nominating convention. Without having rendered service of any sort to recommend them to the favor of the nation, these conventional aspirants rely on their location in the North, the skill in party tactics acquired by them as subalterns at the drill, and the cunning acquired in the intrigues necessary to give prominence to an eager ambition, without the higher faculties to promote it, fitted these men to become the instru-

ments of a section to defeat the sound, settled policy of the nation. But "the day of small things," of enslaved Presidents, or buccaneers, will pass away, and the nation of the New World will resume the attitude which the moral grandeur of the great men who directed its affairs for the first half century, gave it. Then the time will come for a new movement on this continent, which will confer prosperity on these races of men.

Mr. Chairman, it is evident to every man of thought, that the freed blacks hold a place in this country which cannot be maintained. Those who have fled to the North are most unwelcome visitors. The strong repugnance of the free white laborer to be yoked with the negro refugee breeds an enmity between races, which must end in the expulsion of the latter. Centuries could not reconcile the Spaniards to the Moors, and although the latter were the most useful people in Spain, their expulsion was the only way to peace. In spite of all that reason or religion can urge, nature has put a badge upon the African, making amalgamation revolting to our race. Centuries have shown that even the aboriginal race of this continent, although approaching our species in every respect more nearly, perish from contiguity with the white man. But I will not argue the point. The law of the North has put its ban upon immigration of negroes into the free States.

In the South, causes more potent still make it impossible that the emancipated blacks can remain there. The multiplication of slaves and freed men of the same caste in the section where the dominant race must become proportionally fewer from emigration, has already compelled the latter to prohibit emancipation within the States, and to seek means of deliverance from the free blacks. The Northern States will not receive them; the Southern States dare not retain them. What is to be done? What was done with the native population which it was found incompatible with the interests of Georgia and the States southwest of the Ohio, and the States northwest, to indulge with homes within their limits? The United States held it to be a national duty to purchase their lands from them, acquire homes for them in other regions, and to hold out inducements and provide the means for their removal to them. Have not the negroes, born on our soil, who have grown up among us, and although fated to be a burden and obstruction to our progress—yet always in amity and laboring to render service—equal claims upon us with the savages, against whom we have had to fight our way for centuries, resisting all attempts to bring them within the pale of civilization?

The President, in his late message, proposes to gather these savages in colonies, and at an early day raise them to the dignity of forming States, and assuming equality with the States of the Union. The Africans, bred and educated within civilized communities, who speak our language, are listeners at our canvasses, lookers-on at the elections, worshippers in our churches, and constantly witness the processes of improvement in our society, in the field, the workshop, and every domestic scene—one would think quite as capable of being disciplined in colonies, and fitted to take part in the Government of the Union as the Shawnees, Pottawatomies, Winnebagoes, the Sacs and Foxes, removed from the northwest; or the Cherokees, Choctaws, Creeks, and Seminoles from the southwest; as far as respects the Sioux, Pawnees, Cheyennes, Utahs, Camanches and Blackfeet, the President might have spared his recommendation until they were caught.

And ought not the Government to be equally provident for such portions of the unfortunate race born to slavery, but who having attained freedom,

find that it renders them a burden to those among whom they live—a burden that will not be borne? This is the question which absolute necessity now forces on the consideration of the country—one deeply affecting the interests and feelings of slaveholders of the superior race, and of more than half a million already manumitted inferiors pressed down by their weight.

Mr. Chairman, it is to this country, rich in mines, in every tropical production, and open to our emigrants and to our commerce through two great bays, one on the Pacific and the other on the Atlantic, and within three days steaming of our own coast, that I would propose to form a settlement for such of our colored race now free, or that may hereafter be freed, as might volunteer to establish it under the auspices of our Government.

The position which things are taking on the shores of Central America indicates a rivalry between England and the United States, as to the power which is to exert the command over that region; to people it, civilize it, give it peace; in a word, make it to some extent a dependency—the only mode of saving it from barbarism, and from becoming a nuisance. The British Government has sent in its subjects—free colored persons, Jamaica negroes—into the logwood and mahogany cuttings in Honduras, and into the Bay Islands, where she claimed a protectorate. She has restored the latter to the Government on the main land, stipulating that all the rights that make freemen of the people of England or in the United States shall be held under a sacred guarantee. Mr. Buchanan says in his late message, that this security taken for the people of the Bay Islands, is the establishment of “a State, at all times subject to the British influence and control.” And how would he prevent it? By stripping off the civil rights the people enjoy, and subjecting them to a dictator? He especially objects to their having “legislative, executive and judicial officers, elected by themselves; or being exempt from the taxing power in every form,” against the consent of their representatives: “the performance of military service, except for their own conclusive defence;” but above all, he holds the provision “that slavery shall not at any time hereafter be permitted to exist therein,” to be the most obnoxious.

Now, I do not believe that the people of the United States will allow Mr. Buchanan to wage a war against Great Britain to establish slavery in the Bay Islands, any more than they will allow him to establish it in Kansas by force of arms. Nor will they countenance his hostility to freedom of religious belief in the Bay Islands; nor the right of *habeas corpus*; nor of voting the taxes to be imposed on them, and providing exclusively for their own military defence. It is a scandal to the age that an American President objects to the guarantee of the American bill of rights, to secure the freedom of any people.

Instead of opposing, I think we should follow the example of England, and carry to the main land of Central America, such of our free colored population as may be willing to go, upon the invitation of the liberal party in that country, and extend our guarantee of freedom over them and the whole section of country which our Government may acquire, by purchase, for their reception. There is a necessity that some great civilized power should step in, to restore order and industry, under the guarantee of free and stable institutions. England tenders the security of her crown, and the best usages that have ever grown up under a crown. We should offer the support of our Constitution, and the earnest of prosperous freedom

which it has assured to our Northern Republic. Which they would choose, the Southern Republics have already evinced, in the forms they have adopted; and the encroachments of our transatlantic brethren would never have been attempted, but for the departures manifested in late movements from the principles of the founders of our Government. While Great Britain has been breaking down slavery and monopoly in the West Indies, the hand that has been felt from this quarter was that of the filibusters. Cuba was ready to fly into the embraces of the United States, when she was repelled by two successive lawless expeditions, unmistakably marked by the features of the buccaneers who ravaged that island of old.

And what have been the concomitants of Gen. Walker's invasion? A proclamation, revoking the constitutional decree delivering the greatest mass of the people from slavery and the principle thus manifested, was fitly illustrated by military executions, butcheries in the streets of the cities, and lastly, by the conflagration of one of the oldest cities. These atrocities had the effect of uniting the people of these distracted States, at last, in one common object—the expulsion of the oppressor. Happily for the fame of our country, the renewal of this horrible enterprise has been thoroughly rebuked by the patriotism, courage and decision of Commodore Paulding. The name has acquired a new lustre to emblazon that which it inherits from the Revolution. If the Commodore's act had the sanction of the Administration in advance, or shall receive it now, some proof will be given that it is not altogether degenerate, and much will have been done to remove from us the aversion, the want of confidence in the justice of this Republic, and the fear that it countenances a design to fix a yoke on Central America, instead of rescuing it from usurpation—results to be hailed as tending to fit our government for the relation it should hold towards the Republics of this continent.

If, on the other hand, the Administration takes part with Walker and the faction in this country that support him, it will show to all the world that the scheme for the propagation of slavery by the sword of which it has given strong indications in Kansas, is extended to the whole regions of the South. Such a scheme can never succeed unless the principle avowed as the basis of it, by Walker, shall prevail. *The triumph of "military rule"* over civil institutions in the slave States, North and West, must be won as the first step to conquest; and then, as the next step, the whole power of the free Republics on this side of the Atlantic, and the hostile feeling, if not the direct force of Europe, must be encountered. The connection of the Atchison-Kansas conspiracy with that of Walker's against Central America, is visible in the instruments who put them in motion. The same men, North and South, encourage both. Funds were raised for them in the same quarters; and such men as Colonel Titus are seen to emerge at one time in Kansas, at another in Nicaragua. The masses of the people nor their elevated statesman, neither of the North nor South, of the East or West, not even the great body of the slave owners, have any heart in the propagation of slavery. Apart from the politicians who use the question for their own advancement, the design has no support but in the enemies of the Union, who hate free government from the bitterness of their hearts, or from a vanity they would dignify as aristocratic pride.

In my opinion, the propagation of slavery can only be successfully resisted by the propagation of freedom. It is this mission, arrogated by Great Britain as peculiarly hers, which has conferred on her the preponder-

ance she holds in almost every portion of the earth. She has swayed it with an iron hand, but everywhere, of late years, Anglo-Saxon justice, civilization and Christianity, wherever they prevailed, have allowed every man to feel the comfort of laboring for himself, and he has labored all the better for his country. * * * This redemption of our own race from its vassalage under slavery has been brought to a stand-still, and six millions of our free white kindred, endure deprivation, corporeal and intellectual, from the slave occupation of the soil and of the pursuits which would add to their means of living and their sources of mental improvement. Neither the slave owners, nor the slave States, are responsible for the arrest of the enfranchisement which promised blessings to the toilers of both races. For, whether as a slave or free man, the presence of multitudes of the black race is found to be fatal to the interests of our race; their antagonism is as strong as that of oil and water, and so long as no convenient outlet, through which the manumitted slave can reach a congenial climate and country willing to receive him, is afforded, the institution of slavery stands on compulsion. But let me suppose Central America—tempting in gold and every production of the tropical soil to stimulate exertion, with a climate innoxious only to the black man—were opened up to him, under circumstances to advance him in the scale of humanity, how long before masters in all the temperate slave States would make compositions to liberate them on terms that would indemnify them for transplantation? Hundreds of more benevolent owners would, from a sense of public good and for conscience sake, by wills, or by deeds of emancipation, make this deliverance, if the General Government would take the charge of the deportation to the region, it might acquire for them a gradual and voluntary emancipation by individuals, if not by States, would thus in time be accomplished. I hold that it is the duty of the nation to offer this boon to slave-holders and to the slave States, to enable them to have complete control of the subject, which is the source of so much anxiety and mischief to them.

What a change would soon be wrought in the condition of Maryland and Virginia, Tennessee and Kentucky, and in my own State, Missouri, if a smooth way were opened into the heart of the tropics—prodigal of wealth in the soil, in the mines, and in the forests; where the labor of the robust and skilful freedman, assisted by the capital and instruction, and inspired by the energy of enterprising American merchants, miners, or planters, would start everything into life. The mixed condition of the four different classes, which, in our grain-growing States, obstruct each other; the masters dependent on the slaves, the slaves on their masters; the free negroes hanging on the skirts of both; while the great mass, the free white laborers, are cast out, in a great measure, from employment and all ownership in the soil, would be succeeded by the most useful of all the tillers of the earth, small freeholders and an independent tenantry. The influx of immigrants from Europe and the North, with moderate capital already running into Maryland and Virginia, would, as these States sloughed the black skin, fill up the rich region around the Chesapeake Bay, the noblest bay in the world, fed by the most beautiful rivers, and brooded over by the most genial climate, and make it fulfil the prediction of Washington, who said, slavery abolished, it would become "the garden of America." The wilderness shores of the great inland sea, now almost as silent as in the days of Powhattan, would be alive with population; and the waters, now covered with swans, wild geese, and wild ducks, would be covered with sail.

and kept in commotion by the rush of steamers over them. The great rivers that run to waste over many latitudes of the healthful temperate zone would thunder with machinery, and the little Merrimack in Massachusetts, which, though frozen half the year, produces ninety millions of manufactures, would find more than a hundred rivals in giant streams which are precipitated in the Chesapeake. The mountains would give to the hand of free labor boundless wealth in coal, salt and ores, and their surface in pasturing innumerable herds and flocks. The plains and valleys would teem with grain, the lowlands with meadow, and the Old Dominion, instead of being "the lone mother of dead empires," would resume her hereditary crown and nascent strength, imparting new growth to all her offspring States. The noble ambition which once led the way to pre-eminence in this great Confederacy must again be attained by a love of liberty, by a love of justice, by a magnanimous patriotism, prompt to make any sacrifice of temporary convenience for the great moral and political principles, the foundation of free institutions. The attempt to enforce slavery in Kansas and Central America by the sword, and thus make the whole intermediate space on the continent fall under its ascendancy, will fail. There is no Mohammed to establish such a dominion, nor is this age—the age of Christian strength and popular power—one to succumb to slavery propagandist prophets. Indeed, the Moslems all over the world have fallen so low, under the influence of this part of their creed, that they are obliged to surrender, and take the law from the accursed nations they stigmatize as Franks. The civilized world is at war with the propagation of slavery, whether by fraud or by the sword; and those who look to gain political ascendancy on the continent by bringing the weight of this system, like an enormous yoke, not to subject the slaves only, but also their fellow-citizens and kindred of the same blood, have made false auguries of the signs of the times.

MISSOURI.—The stand that Missouri has taken upon the emancipation question, makes her now the great centre of interest, both North and South. Doubtless in the next few years, emigration will pour into Missouri with the same mighty wave with which it is now flowing over more Northern territory. The Boston Traveller thus speaks in reference to the noble future of this State :

"Missouri is a State to which the attention of emigrants from the Northern, the Eastern and the Middle States should be directed, and also that of Europeans, who are seeking homes in America. In soil, in climate, in productions, in commercial position, no State can claim an advantage over her. Her political opinion is such, that once freed from slavery, she must rapidly become all that Virginia formerly was, and which that venerable republic might have continued for years to be, if she had been true to the principles of her revolutionary patriots. Missouri is the centre of the Union. She stretches one hand to the Atlantic, and the other to the Pacific. The national capitol must, one day, be on her ground, and it ought to be on free soil only that such a city should stand. Every moral and material consideration that ought to have weight with intelligent emigrants, points to Missouri as one of the noblest fields for the exercise of their enterprise and ingenuity, that is to be found in the entire of that broad domain that America owns.

There is no Property in Man.

S P E E C H

OF THE

HON. OWEN LOVEJOY,

OF ILLINOIS,

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WEDNESDAY,
FEBRUARY 17, 1858.

Mr. LOVEJOY delivered a strong, bold, and eloquent speech on the Rights of Man, in Congress, on the 17th instant. He began by saying there was no conflict between the North and the South—a sectional strife between two parties of the country—that there was no envy between the producers of maize, wheat and sorghum, in the North, and the growers of rice, cotton and cane in the South. The conflict was not between sections, but between Freedom and Slavery—between the principles of Liberty and those of Despotism. After an eloquent elaboration of this idea, he passed on to say:

And this brings me, Sir, to the question I desire to discuss—the question not only of the day, but of the age—the most important question that has agitated the country since the Revolution, and the most solemn and grave one with which Christian civilization has had to grapple in modern times.

The President, in his message, claims, or rather assumes, that human beings are property in the absolute and unqualified sense—property as the grazing ox or the bale of merchandise is property; and that the tenure of this property is a natural and indefeasible right, guaranteed by the Constitution. And it has been averred on the floor of this House, that, as an abstract principle, the system of American Slavery was right, having the sanction of natural and of revealed religion. As the whole of this discussion, in its real merits, hinges on this principle or dogma, I confront it at the very threshold, and deny it. I affirm that it has not the sanction of natural or revealed religion, or of the Constitution.

I need not say that this is a new doctrine, unknown to the fathers and founders of the Republic. Indeed, till within a very few years, slavery was acknowledged by all classes, in the slave no less than in the free States, to be an evil, social, moral, and political—a wrong to the slave, a detriment to the master, and a blight on the soil; its very existence deplored, and its ultimate extermination looked forward to with earnest and often impatient hope. It was regarded as the relic of a barbarous age, which must disappear before the advancing civilization of the present. It was deemed to be contrary to the benign spirit and precepts of the Christian religion, which would ere long supplant it. Many of its ablest and truest opponents were reared in the midst of it, and could be called neither intermeddlers nor fanatics. No one pretended that it had any right whatever, beyond the limits of the local laws which created and protected it.

But all this is changed now. The demon of slavery has come forth from the tombs. It has grown bold and defiant and impudent. It has left its lair, lifted its shameless front towards the skies, and with horrid

contortions and gyrations, mouths the heavens, and mutters its blasphemies about having the sanction of a holy and just God; dodges behind the national compact, and grins and chatters out its senile puerilities about Constitutional sanction; and then, like a very fantastic ape, jumps upon the bench, puts on ermine and wig, and pronounces the dictum that a certain class of human beings have no rights which another certain class are bound to regard; and then it claims the right to stalk abroad through the length and breadth of the land, robbing the poor free laborer of his heritage, trampling on congressional prohibitions, crushing out beneath its tread State Sovereignty and State Constitutions. It claims the right to pollute the Territories with its slimy footsteps, and then makes its way to the very home of freedom in the free States, carried there on a Constitutional palanquin, manufactured and borne aloft on the one side by a Democratic Executive, and on the other by a Democratic Jesuit Judge! It claims the right to annihilate free schools—for this its very pressure achieves—to hamper a free press, to defile the pulpit, to corrupt religion, and to stifle free thought and free speech! It claims the right to convert the fruitful field into a wilderness, so that forests shall grow up around grave-yards, and the populous village become a habitation for owls. It claims the right to transform the free laborer, by a process of imperceptible degradation, to a condition only not worse than that of the slave. Yes, Sir, while the border ruffians are striving, by alternate violence and fraud, to force slavery into Kansas, the President and Chief Justice, by new, unheard of, and most unwarrantable interpretations of the Constitution, are endeavoring to enthrone and nationalize slavery, and make it the dominant power in the land, and are calling upon the people, in the name of Democracy, to crowd up to the temple gates of the demon worship! And all this upon the false, atrocious, and impious averment, that human beings are property! Again I meet this doctrine, and spurn it. The Supreme Being never intended that human beings should be property.

In those far-off solitudes of the past, when that sublime manifestation of Almighty power was to be made in the formation of a human being, what was the utterance that fell from the Divine lips? "And God said, let us make man in our own image, after our likeness; and in the image of God created he him." Made but little lower than the angels, crowned with glory and honor, there stood man, the delegated lord and possessor of the earth, and of all the irrational existence with which it teemed. This similitude of man to God is a reality. There is, in man's spiritual nature, a miniature God—debased this likeness may be, disfigured and dim, still there is the Divine tracery. The pearl may be in the oozy bed of ocean's slime; still it is capable of being burnished and made to glisten in the firmament of a future and immortal life.

When a monarch confides his signet ring to another, though that other be a beggar, that symbol carries with it the power and protection of royalty. And on whatever being the Divine artist has traced the image of himself, I insist that being cannot, without wrong and impiety, be made an article of property. This spiritual existence with which man is endowed—this transcript of the Creator's likeness—is not a temporary endowment, but an endless gift.

"The sun is but a spark of fire;
A transient meteor in the sky:
The soul, immortal as its sire,
Shall never die!"

Shall a being thus highly endowed, and destined to an endless duration, be crowded down to the level of the brutes that perish? Does any one believe that this is in accordance with the Divine will?

As from the altitude of the stars, all inequalities of earth's surface disappear, so from the stand-point of man's immortality all distinctions fade away, and every human being stands on the broad level of equality. To chattelize a rational creature thus endowed and thus allied, is to insult and incense the author of his being.

Look at it from another point. Eighteen centuries ago appeared the most wonderful personage that has ever moved among men—the God-man—the Deity manifested in human form. After a life of chosen poverty, passed amid the poor and lowly, he laid down his life to expiate the sins of man. President Buchanan, believest thou the gospel record? I know that thou believest. Tell me, then, Sir, did Christ shed his blood for cattle? Did he lay down his life to replevin personal property, to redeem real estate? I tell you, gentlemen, that this property claim in man, is impiety, rank and foul, against God and his anointed.

“Eternal Nature! when thy giant hand
Had heaved the floods, and fixed the trembling land—
When life sprang startled at thy plastic call,
Endless her forms, and man the lord of all—
Say, was that lordly form inspired by thee
To wear eternal chains and bow the knee?
Was man ordained the slave of man to toil,
Yoked with the brutes and fettered to the soil,
Weighed in a tyrant's balance with his gold?
No! nature stamped us in a heavenly mould.
She bade no wretch his thankless labors urge,
Nor, trembling, take his pittance and the scourge;
No homeless Lybian on the stormy deep,
To call upon his native land and weep.”

I adopt, with cordial admiration, the language of England's great statesman:

“While mankind loath rapine, detest fraud, and abhor blood, they will reject with horror the wild and guilty fantasy that man can hold property in man.”

In our preamble to the resolutions inviting clergymen to officiate as chaplains, we have avowed our belief in Christianity. One of the divinest utterances of that religion is: “All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do you even so to them.” The President, in his recent message, justly says that the avowed principles which lie at the foundation of the laws of nations, is contained in this Divine precept.

Take one single feature of slavery; it annihilates the family; it tolerates no home; it tears with relentless diabolism its plowshare beam deep right through God's domestic institution; and having leveled it with the dust, rears the devil's domestic institution, and transforms the home, the house, into a stable, and its inmates into cattle. The relation of husband and wife, of parent and child, and the endearments of the home circle, are not, and cannot be legally known among the victims of slavery.

What a contrast between that family portrayed in the Cotter's Saturday Night—though they were in the depths of poverty, though they had been out to service during the week; what a contrast between that rude home and the best slave dwelling! From one springs a country's glory and greatness; from the other, a country's decay, shame, and disgrace.

Take away what there is of earthly happiness growing out of the endearments of home, and how much of human felicity have you left? I look around me, and see scores of men, many of whom have, in homes more or less distant, those dearer than life. Can any one prove to you, gentlemen, by any course of reasoning, that it would be right, under any possible circumstances, to doom those children to the auction block, to be sold like cattle? If I can prove that it is right to take and chattelize another man's children, then he can prove it is right to do the same with mine. Make it right, as an abstract principle, to enslave one human being, and you have broken down the barriers that protect every human being.

I come now to the Constitutional question. The limits that I have assigned myself will not allow a full or even an extended discussion of this point. The President contents himself with declaring, in general terms, that the Constitution regards slaves as property, and adds that this has at last been settled by the highest judicial authority in the land. The Chief Justice, who, according to the Executive, has settled this question, also alludes, in a general way, to the Constitution, and bases his dictum on contemporaneous history and sentiments, rather than upon anything found in that instrument. Both these gentlemen profess to be strict constructionists of the Constitution. Now, I beg to ask them upon what portion of the Constitution they rely for the support of this property dogma? They say it is in the Constitution. I say it is not in the Constitution; and in the absence of all proof, my say is as good as theirs. In no article, in no section, in no line, word or syllable, or letter, is the idea of property in man expressed or implied. It is a mystery to me how any man could ever believe it; and it is a double mystery to me how an utterance so absolutely untrue and so slanderous towards the framers of the Constitution, could be thrust before the American people from the supreme judiciary, and receive the sanction of the Chief Magistrate. An ancient Roman prince said, that if truth should be driven from every other place, it ought to find a home in the hearts of rulers.

We have fallen upon evil times, when a Chief Justice and a Chief Magistrate deliberately and officially utter what, seemingly, they must know to be untrue. Terrible are the necessities and exactions of slavery! How can these gentlemen help knowing that these declarations are untrue? Do they not contradict the entire history of the country? Do they not contradict the repeated declarations of Madison on this very point? Has he not averred, over and over again, that the idea of property was carefully kept out of the Constitution, so that when slavery should cease to exist in the States, there would be no evidence in that instrument that it had ever existed at all? And now, this instrument, so instinct with the spirit of Freedom, so abhorring the idea of property in man, that it would not be polluted with the word *slave*, slavery, or servitude, even this Constitution is assumed, by its own inherent force, without any express law or legislative sanction whatever, to carry human chattelism into the Territory of Kansas, and if into the Territory of Kansas, into the *State* of Kansas; for what right has Kansas, or any other State, to adopt a Constitution that contradicts or invalidates the Constitution of the United States? If the slave-owner holds his slave in Kansas by a tenure derived from the Constitution, I would like to know what power can take it away? If a new State forms a Constitution with a clause prohibiting slavery, and comes and asks admission into the Union with such an organic law, it must be sent back with a mandate to strike out the prohibitory clause, as being

contrary to the Federal Constitution. This has at last been settled by the highest judicial tribunal in the land. And it is a mystery to President Buchanan how any one ever could doubt it. Under this doctrine, carried to its logical results, no more free States could ever be added to the Union. *Proh pudor!* To this complexion it must come at last. To this complexion it has come already. The question now is, whether the country shall be the home of freedom or the lair of slavery; whether the despotism of the fetter and the scourge shall wield the sceptre, and liberty be driven into exile.

But still farther as to this property principle. If human beings are property, as is now claimed, why has Federal legislation declared the slave trade piracy? Is it piracy to go to the coast of Africa and trade in elephants' teeth, or in palm oil, or in any other article of commerce that may be produced there? If this property claim is correct, then this law is unjust, and ought to be repealed, unless it is to be considered in the light of a protective tariff to encourage and promote slave-breeding at home.

More than this: how often is it that when slave-owners lie down upon the death-couch and look the future in the face, they emancipate their slaves? How often do they do it as a reward for some heroic achievement? Did you ever hear of men emancipating their cattle in their last will and testament? Do they ever bequeath freedom to their swine, or extend that precious boon to a Newfoundland dog that had rescued a child from a watery grave?

Besides, to whom belong all the stray cattle that are without owners in this country? There is certainly a goodly herd of them. How many millions of dollars worth I have not the means at hand of estimating accurately. Perhaps at the instance of the President, the Chief Justice would enter up a judgment against them and issue a *capias*. They have no rights that are to be regarded. They are property, and all property ought to have an owner. They would bring a goodly sum, hard as are the times, enough to go far towards carrying Pennsylvania for a second term. But I meant to be serious, and I will.

I have no patience with these abhorrent assumptions, for I cannot call them arguments, which claim property in man. Such claims are an insult to the intelligence, the Christianity, and the civilization of the age.

I have a final objection to urge against slavery, and much more against its expansion. It lies across our country's glory and destiny.

Century after century rolled over the world, nay, whole decades of centuries wore wearily away in earth's history, and the dogma gained universal prevalence and belief that kings ruled by right divine. *Dei gratia rex*, was engraved on their coin. This dogma was by education incorporated into the common faith and acquired all the strength of a religious principle, and all the ardor of a devotional sentiment. I need not recite the unhappy results that flowed to mankind from the prevalence of this dogma. Monarchs wielded a sceptre of iron. The masses were deemed of no value, only as they could minister to the lust, power, or ambition of the ruling class. The Government was not made for them, but they for the Government. Their blood saturated the soil, and their bones enriched it. They had no rights that kings were bound to regard. But the recital of the woes and wrongs inflicted and endured under the supremacy of this notion of the Divine right of kings would be an inimitable story—it would indeed be a history of the human race during the cycles of ages that they have inhabited the globe. Heaven and earth became alike weary of this

state of things. The period arrived when the Great Ruler would introduce a new theory of government. The curtain was to roll up and exhibit a new act in earth's drama. America was the theatre where this manifestation was to be made. The old pilgrim barks, borne as if by a miracle over the angry ocean, came freighted with the elements of a new political life, and the germ of a new national organization. How they planted themselves at Jamestown and at Plymouth you know. How they struggled on in their colonial dependence against forest and savage, and British aggressions, you need not be told.

Then came the crisis of our fate! Our ancestors, Cavalier and Roundhead, and I bless their memory, met that crisis manfully, heroically. They came to the revolution, and on its threshold it was that God poured that wonderful illumination over the mind of Jefferson, and inspired the utterance of those everlasting truths. How grandly majestic they come rolling down from the past, baptized in the blood that flowed from patriotic hearts. "We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." This principle laid the axe at the root of the old and long dominant dogma, that one man, or race of men, was created to be kings or nobles, and another to be perpetual peasants and serfs. It placed them upon the broad level of absolute equality, so far as natural rights were concerned. It does not say all British subjects born on this side of the ocean are equal to those born on the other side of it; it does not say all *Englishmen* are born equal, or all *Frenchmen*, or all *Dutchmen*, or all *whitemen*, or all *tawnymen*, or all *blackmen*, but **ALL MEN**. That every human being endowed with a rational existence, created in the image of his God, was equally entitled to life and liberty. It is on this principle that criminal jurisprudence rests. The law in its Divine impartiality, exacts the life of the murderer, whatever his position, for that of his victim. Whatever may have been the intellectual endowments of the homicide, however exalted his social position, he must pay the forfeit of his life for slaying the most abject and idiotic of his species. And why? Because the life of the poor and debased victim was as sacred and inviolable as that of his gifted and exalted slayer. The one was equally entitled to his life as the other. So precisely with regard to liberty. To *that* every human being is equally entitled.

To protect these rights, Governments are instituted among men. Not to bestow rights are governments instituted among men, but to protect those which God has already given antecedent to all organic forms of government. I do not depend upon parliaments, or kings, or congresses, or majorities for my rights. I hold them direct from the Creator who formed me. So does every human being. The man, or body of men, who take away these rights without the forms of law, unless forfeited by crime, are despots, tyrants and usurpers, and by the very act forfeit their own.

If a man is robbed of these rights it makes no difference whether it is done by one man called a king, or by many men called a majority. I do not subscribe to that translucent phantom of popular sovereignty when it claims the right to enslave men. In a company of a hundred men, have ninety-nine the right to rob the hundredth, provided even it is submitted to them and they have a fair election? A majority of a hundred men, of which I am one, may have the right to make rules which shall operate alike upon us all. But when they come to commend an embittered chalice to my lips, of which they will not themselves partake, then I say they have no right to do it—it is wrong.

If the people of a Territory or of a State will vote that they themselves and their children shall alike be slaves, I am content. But that a majority have the rightful power to take away the natural rights of any one single human being, I deny. Those rights, I repeat, are given and guarded by the common Father of us all. And as the parental instincts go forth with peculiar energy and jealousy toward the unfortunate and less favored member of the family circle, protecting his interests and avenging his wrongs, so the Divine Parent watches with peculiar vigilance over the rights of the weak and hapless ones of earth, and avenges their injuries with a terrible and unusual retribution. Did it never occur to you, gentlemen, that as with the individual, so with the nation? Power, elevation, rare endowment, instead of conferring privileges and prerogatives, impose obligation. The All-Wise is the All-Good as well; and it is His goodness that claims our adoration. And that one expression, which we have been taught to lisp in childhood, and to utter in the strength of years—"Our Father"—is the Magna Charta of human brotherhood and of human equality before God and before the law.

What now is our country's duty, destiny, and true glory? To go marauding over the territories of weaker nations like buccaneers and picaroons, to extend the area of slavery; to hunt down fugitive slaves and take them back, manacled, to bondage; to break down the dykes of freedom and let the dark and ensanguined waters of slavery rush in a destructive flood over the land? No! In the name of the fathers, in the name of the Constitution, in the name of the Declaration, in the name of our dignity and position, and in the name of God, no! The true mission of this nation, the work assigned, the trust committed, is to reduce to organic form as we have already done, and now to illustrate before the world, the great and ever-enduring truths that I have recited, and thus to exemplify before the nations of the earth the principles of civil and religious freedom and equality, and so teach them that their monarchies and despotisms are usurpations. I never read that Declaration but with new admiration and delight. So comprehensive, yet so full. Embracing the entire Divine theory of human government in a single paragraph. All men endowed by their Creator with an equal title to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness! Governments instituted among men to secure these rights, deriving all their just powers from the consent of the governed!

We hear about keeping step to the music of the Union. Sir, go build a huge organ on the shelving sides of the Rocky Mountains, and let the angel of liberty strike its keys and chant forth that sublime and grand old anthem of universal freedom; and then, as its notes roll over the land, solemn and majestic, in God's name, Sir, I will keep step to the music of the Union. It is a divine symphony. But when you call upon me to keep step to the sound of clanking chains, and of human manacles, to the wild shriek of human agony and suffering, I cannot do it. It grates upon me like the very dissonance of hell. I cannot keep step to such music.

And now, Sir, why do we stand thus proudly pre-eminent among the nations of the earth? Why has this nation been led to a position so grand and enviable? Is it because God is any respecter of persons or of nations? Not that; but because He has a grand work for us to do—to lead the world to freedom and glory; to the conscious possession and unmolested enjoyment of rights divinely given. And why should we abandon this position? Why are we called upon to betray the high and solemn trusts

committed to our care by the Most High? Why are we asked to wheel around from the van in the progress of a Christian civilization, and with muffled drums and drooping colors march back a decade of centuries into the darkness and barbarism of the past? Why should we, by our refusal to fulfil the destiny plainly marked out for us by the finger of God, yield the honor of earth's renovation to some other people? What is to reward us for all this shame, loss of position and recreancy to heaven-confided trusts? Will the clank of human fetters on the plains of Kansas, and the wail of man's despair on the Pacific shore, compensate us for this sacrifice?

Oh, how much more noble and heroic for those who have it in their power to say, in God's name, this evil must be removed. What a future then flashes on our country! In those ages to come, by a natural process of assimilation and peaceful expansion, we shall conquer and possess the entire continent. The genius of Freedom, on some lofty peak of the Rocky Mountains or the Andes, should look abroad, northward and southward, eastward and westward, and behold one vast ocean of republics, bound together by the federal compact,

"Distinct like the billows, yet one like the sea."

And as the recording angel dropped a tear of sorrow on the good man's oath, and blotted it out forever, so the genius of History, when she came to trace our record, would drop a tear of regret, and blot out the fact that Slavery ever existed. With this result in view, the Constitution was formed.

Shades of the departed, hovering around this Hall, I bless your memories for that Constitution.

Mexican Affairs.

Deplorable Condition of Mexico—Interference in her Affairs becoming Necessary—Plan for a Protectorate, &c.

WASHINGTON, Monday, March 5, 1858.

The affairs of Mexico are attracting a good deal of attention here, and the Administration is frequently discussing plans for the relief of our sister Republic, which for want of a stable Government, seems to have fallen into chronic decay. The time certainly appears to be near at hand when, for the sake of good neighborhood, the Government of the United States will be compelled to adopt some active measures for the abatement of the nuisance which our sister Republic is becoming, rather than being a liberal contributor, as she should, to the general stock of prosperity and wealth. Good and reliable government, to give security to life and property, is all Mexico needs to make her prosperous, wealthy and happy. Her internal resources are rivaled nowhere. Her soil and climate are excellent, and both mines and facilities for manufacturing abound throughout her domain. But all lie undeveloped, simply because few are willing to risk their lives or their capital in developing these resources, in a country where a political storm may at an hour's notice deprive them of everything.

Notwithstanding the improvidence and profligacy of Mexico, and crude as is her development, her revenues from customs alone could have been farmed out years ago for \$12,000,000 per annum, and there is no doubt that an honest and economical administration of the Custom Department

would add twenty per cent. to this amount. \$8,000,000 of this should be sufficient for the expenses of the Government, leaving from four to six millions with which to pay the interest on the public debt, and finally extinguish it, while now she is, in fact, bankrupt, unable to pay her interest even, and continually becoming more and more involved. At present the revenues are squandered in the most shameful manner, much of them, in fact, exhausted in the schemes of petty politicians to retain or maintain position in the Government. Put an end to all that by some plan which shall insure a permanent and honest administration of affairs, and Mexico is at least capable of discharging all her obligations as a member of the family of nations.

But she is capable of much more than this. Give the needed security to life and property, and a single branch of her industry—that of mining—will add from twenty to thirty millions of silver per annum to the present supply. It is unnecessary to moralize upon the beneficial effect that this accretion of the precious metals would have upon the business of all commercial nations. It is sufficient to suggest the vast advantages which would flow to Mexico herself from the production of this amount of silver. Not the miner alone would be benefited; but every branch of human industry would thrive under its influence, and a healthful immigration would flow into Mexico, and in a few years establish her as a first class power among the nations. Why should this not be? What does she lack but men, capital and enterprise? Absolutely nothing. Nature has done for her all that could be asked. The man of enterprise finds there a charming climate, all the elements of civilization, society and cultivated soil; and, when we remember the dream-like prosperity of California, based entirely upon mineral wealth—notwithstanding the pioneers there had to contend with an unbroken wilderness—what may we not expect of more favored Mexico, if her Government is only placed upon a basis which will secure to her the benefits of enterprise similar to that which has made a great and powerful State of California?

With all these elements of wealth and prosperity, Mexico, nevertheless, is bankrupt, convulsed by petty revolutions, cursed by the most shameless corruption of her officials, unable to pay her debts, and rapidly sinking lower and still lower into the pit of ruin. At this very hour she is looking to the United States for pecuniary aid to enable her to retrieve present difficulties, and again establish some sort of government. So desirable is it to us that order should reign there, that our people might be willing to let her have the money, if it would effect any permanent good result and could be satisfactorily secured; but we cannot purchase her territory as heretofore. The day for that has passed, as Mr. Buchanan will find, if he ever succeeds in his plan of negotiating a treaty for the acquisition of Sonora.

We cannot aid Mexico by purchasing her territory, or even by loaning her money on a pledge of territory,—for that would be eventual acquisition. Still Mexico must have money, and it is idle for us to say that we care not where she gets it,—for we do care. She is already responsible to the United States in large amounts for outrages committed upon American citizens; and our Government must insist upon their settlement at some time or other, or assume the liquidation. England, too, will be likely to step in ere long to rescue something from the "sick man's" estate for the satisfaction of her holders of Mexican Bonds.

Upon further examination, I find that these bonds amount to upwards of fifty millions of dollars, the interest upon which, originally was five per cent. After the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo—in 1850, I think Mexico paid some two or three millions arrears of interest, out of the indemnity fund. About this time, Paynos, then Secretary of the Treasury of Mexico, went to Europe, and made a compromise with the bondholders, in which it was agreed that the rate of interest should be reduced to three per cent. per annum, and that then Mexico would set apart twenty-five per cent. of all her receipts from customs for the payment of the interest, and towards the gradual extinction of the principal. Notwithstanding this liberal conduct on the part of the bondholders, Mexico has proved faithless to the contract, permitting the revenues to be embezzled at one time, and to be seized by revolution at another, so that five millions dollars of unpaid interest have already accumulated since the compromise, and been added to the upwards of fifty millions of principal.

These statistics are important, because they show the necessity which must compel England, at no distant day, to take some measures for the collection of her indebtedness, by a seizure of territory or the establishment of a Protectorate, unless the United States shall relieve her of the necessity. They furnish, too, one important clue to the sentiments expressed by the *London Times*, and controverted by no European press, so far as I am aware, in favor of the absorption of Mexico by the United States.

The Americans will not permit England to establish a protectorate, nor to absorb the Mexicans. Certainly not, unless we are prepared to accept the most offensive violation of the celebrated Monroe doctrine, and to permit the establishment of British influences over our sister Republic far greater than those, the exercise of which in Mosquito and the Bay Islands, we have been contesting for a dozen years.

But we cannot play the dog in the manger. If we will not permit Great Britain to collect her debt in that way, we must suggest some other method of securing it to her, or become responsible ourselves. The question how this can be done, is one that must be discussed and settled soon; and its solution may solve also the troubles of our neighbor, and make of her a powerful and profitable ally, if we are only bold enough to grapple with the subject, and to carry out a radical policy. Under all the circumstances, has not the time arrived when it behooves the United States to consider whether or no we ought not assume a protectorate over Mexico, and by the exercise of our moral influence, secure her the stability and good government which alone can save her from dissolution, and enable her to fulfil her obligations as a member of the family of nations? Something must be done; and the simple query is, whether the establishment of the protectorate would not be, on all accounts, the *best* thing. The details of such a plan are easy of comprehension, and the case of the Ionian Islands may furnish a precedent. The Islands became a nuisance of bad neighborhood; and, accordingly, by the Treaty of Paris, in 1815, it was agreed that Great Britain should assume a protectorate over them, which was done; and since that time the Ionian Islands have gone on peacefully and prosperously.

In the case of Mexico, the United States might nominate Comonfort, or any other honest and capable man who has received the suffrages of the people, as the Chief Magistrate of the Republic. In all other respects, the present form of government might be preserved; but it would be understood that the United States would *protect* the Government and maintain

it against popular tumult. The garrisons of the country would pass into the hands of the protecting power, and be manned by the latter with troops enlisted for that special service, the effect of which would be always to keep before the disorganizers the hopelessness of any attempt to gratify their own ambition through the prostration of one Government and the revolutionary elevation of another. *The expense of all this would of course be borne by Mexico herself*, and be far less than the present cost of her army, which contributes more than any other single element to the success of the petty revolutions which are destroying the life of the nation.—*New York Times*.

The True Issue.

Will either of our dough-faced democratic cotemporaries please inform us whether they are *opposed* to the further extension of slavery in this Republic? whether they consider Negroes *human beings*? and whether they believe (as proclaimed by our Declaration of Independence) that "*all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness?*" If they believe this, by what right is *any* man, black or white, made a slave? And why do they, and Judge Taney, and the so-called democratic party, seek to shield their proscription and enslavement of the colored man, behind *color*, and imputed inferiority? Nay, why go farther, and indirectly proscribe *labor* and *laboring men*, without regard to color or condition. Look at it as you will, turn it over and analyze it as you please, yet in its practical application, bearing and effect, it is the enslavement and proscription of *labor* and *laboring men*. No casuist can make less of it than this; and if those who read Judge Taney's decision will, where it declares that "colored" men have no rights which "white men" are bound to respect, substitute "laboring" for colored—and "idlers" for white men, the real merit and intent of the decision will be arrived at.

The *colored* man is not enslaved because he is colored. His color makes him an object of antipathy, renders him friendless and despised, and therefore makes his enslavement possible, and it is done. He is enslaved because he represents in his person intelligent human labor, and his *color* is made the pretext for the outrage, just as the Arabs make the "infidelity" of Christians a pretext and justification for plundering them of their goods. Christians, they say, have no rights which an Arab is bound to respect.

No "chattel" brings as much on the block as the slave—and it is a singular fact in confirmation of our position—that the slave-dealers never dwell upon the "inferiority" or the midnight "color" of their property as recommendations to purchasers—but on the contrary are glad to be able to exhibit them as of light complexion, and to recommend them as sprightly and intelligent, and if they can endorse them as "Ministers of the Gospel" or "Mechanics," they esteem it all the better. And wherefore? Simply because the more *intelligent human labor* the man represents, the more valuable he becomes in the market. The very conditions which Judge Taney assumes to be reasons and justifications for slavery, are the very things which most depreciate the value of slaves, and are carefully ignored in offering them for sale.

Whatever may be the language of Judge Taney's decision, a very superficial examination will show, that his condemnation of men to perpetual servitude, has no reference whatever to *color* or *inferiority*, but is entirely in-

dependent of both. If it were *color*, then an indubitably white complexion, a blue eye, and straight hair, should always entitle their possessor to freedom. And if it were *inferiority*, then wherever *superiority* is plainly manifest, the person should be free. But is such the case? Pick up any southern paper you please, and you will find advertised as run-away slaves, persons who cannot be distinguished from the Caucasians, but must be identified by other means; and the cases on record are innumerable where such are held as slaves. And if to-day an individual were before Judge Taney, on the question of being remanded to slavery, were his complexion as white as the snows of the frosty Caucasus, it would avail him nothing against an affidavit, that he owed service on a rice or cotton plantation. What hypocrisy is it then to talk about *color* as the basis for slavery, when the very men who make the plea, ignore it in their practice every hour of their lives.

Again, as to *inferiority*, take a case: Frederick Douglass, we apprehend, will, by common consent, be admitted to be *superior* to at least nine-tenths of this party who would proscribe him. Yet, to-day, had not kind friends in England purchased and presented him to himself, Judge Taney would, without a moment's hesitation, remand him to perpetual slavery. And his condition is that of thousands of others, who are sensible, intelligent, industrious, temperate and enterprising Christian men.

What a miserable dodge, then, is it for Judge Taney, or the democratic party, to shield their proscription behind *color* and *inferiority*.

We say again, view it as you will, it is simply a matter of the degradation and enslavement of *labor*, and in its *principle*, of very necessity, involves every man who labors—and the question becomes, and is one really, not of *color* or *inferiority*, but of the subjugating, degradation and enslavement of *labor*.

And yet the party that stands thus with its heel upon the neck of labor, claims to be the *democratic* party. Is it entitled to the claim? An oppression of labor, even through the means by which labor thrives, has always been assumed to involve aristocracy; and yet we have here an oppression which extends to the *laborer* himself. Can there be a lower depth of despotism?

Will the *North West*, and the *Express* and *Herald* answer our questions, and then canvass our conclusions? But how can we expect this from editors who always dodge the real questions at issue, and whose only argument is, that some "horrible Black Republican," or some "infatuated Freedom Shrieker," said some awful things, or performed some horrible act?

An American Protectorate Over Mexico.

Quite an excitement is springing up in Washington, New York, and the sea board, over the proposition to establish a *protectorate* over Mexico, by this country. The reasons urged therefor are, that it would provide for the payment of the creditors of Mexico, secure the development of her unbounded resources, and place her beyond the reach of those constant revolutions which render progress and prosperity utterly impossible.

The argument in favor of these suggestions, set forth, that the proposed protectorate does not involve any further acquisition of territory, nor any change in the distribution of political power in the United States, nor will it introduce Mexicans into the Senate or House of Representatives. All

that is sought is, simply a matter of advice and control. 'Thirty years' experience proves that Mexico is utterly incapable of governing herself. Government there is a farce, revolution and anarchy; it is an incessant struggle between contending factions—military leaders and priests—the common object being plunder of the people. The welfare of the people, the promotion of industry, the increase of commerce, the establishment of manufactures, are not considered in the least.

For the United States to annex Mexico would bring ruin upon ourselves. She would throw forty Senators and seventy Representatives into Congress, speaking a foreign language, and holding principles inimical to American institutions and freedom. A *protectorate* would confer upon us all the benefits of enlarged trade and commerce that could possibly be gained by annexation, while we would escape all the evils the latter would inflict.

The friends of the protectorate scheme sum up their arguments thus:

"The Republic of Mexico is dying. We must either succor her—let her be succored by an European power upon terms disadvantageous to our own interests—or permit her to fall to pieces, and grab a portion of her territory, which we don't want, to satisfy our demands against her. We can succor her only by a protectorate, or by an acquisition of territory. The latter is impolitic, to say the least. The advantages of the protectorate are these: *First*—It would cost us nothing, because Mexico would pay all its expenses. *Second*—It would give us the desired good neighborhood without having to purchase territory, and with it a national partisan excitement. *Third*—The payment of money for a purchase of territory, if made, would only afford temporary relief, and in a few years we should be called upon just as imperatively for further aid, and the condition of Mexico will not have improved a whit. *Fourth*—Under the protectorate, which would cost us no more than the endorsement of A, No. 1 paper costs an endorser, Mexico would be so developed, as to become to us a great and profitable customer, as well as a valued friend and ally."

It is further stated, that so far from England interposing objections, she is anxious that the United States should take Mexico under her protection. The latter owes British bondholders sixty millions of dollars, and is paying neither principal nor interest. The London *Times*, the organ of British sentiment, in a recent article upon this subject, used the following significant language in regard to it:

"Mexico has now arrived at a point at which any convulsion may improve the prospect of her foreign creditors. In the present state of things they can have no hope, and their great dread, therefore, must be lest it should be perpetuated. If some new military dictator were to arise, or the country were to be absorbed, without more delay, by the United States, their treatment could not be worse, and it might, especially in the latter case, be much better. * * * Let the United States, when they are finally prepared for it, enjoy all the advantages and responsibility of ownership, and our merchants at Liverpool and elsewhere, will be quite content with the trade that will spring out of it. The capacity of the Mexican population for appreciating a constitutional rule, is not so remarkable that we should volunteer to administer it."

We give the foregoing as the views and arguments of those who favor the project, and reserve our own opinions for a subsequent occasion. The reader who desires to hear anything more on the subject, will find an article from the New York *Times* in another column. The rumor that Senator Seward is preparing a speech in favor of the protectorate scheme, we hardly credit.—*Chicago Tribune*.

Is it Slavery or State Rights ?

Failing in the attempt to drive the Lecompton Constitution wholesale down the throats of those who believe that the majority of the people of a State have some constitutional rights touching the making of the laws by which they are to be governed, a most insidious and reckless attempt is being made to arouse all the latent antipathies of extremists, North and South, by proclaiming that the question before Congress is one of slavery or non-slavery.

Nothing more unjust, untrue, or ungenerous, could well be devised; or, being devised, publicly offered for the consideration of either Congress or the people at large. The slavery question has nothing whatever to do with it; and the South, if it goes off on what the *Herald* sneeringly calls its "abstraction," will have deep and serious cause of repentance.

The old adage says, "marry in haste and repent at leisure." If this hollow-cheeked and consumptive Lecompton Constitution, however padded up and painted for the bridal occasion, be wedded by the Democracy, the latter will have soon and sudden a lengthy widowhood for repentance. It will behold the projects of its manhood overthrown, its household gods leveled, and the foundation of its hopes blasted; for the offspring begat of the temporary union will all have in them the seeds of that constitution-wrecking disease, which no healing power can eradicate, nor fate itself alter. Under any circumstances, the disease can only be prolonged.

The *Union* admits, the *Herald* admits, the members of Congress who are luring the Democracy to this wretched and unwholesome alliance admit, that the reversion of the Lecompton Constitution is inevitable; that the people of Kansas can kill it and will kill it as soon almost as we have recognized its political life. Why, then, should the stalwart Democratic party be allied to a corpse—to a painted bauble that tempts the eye, but "turns to ashes on the lips?" It was not by such alliances that the hardy children—the warriors and statesmen of this Republic—were produced. It was not by such alliances that souls were born of the Republic that expanded its area North and South, and carried the truths of Democratic self-reliance and State-rights individuality, that have made this country the rival not alone of any one European nation, but all Europe combined, and the wonder of even itself as well as of the world. It could not act otherwise, even though it could scarcely account for the magic strides by which it stalked into prominence, dignity and wealth.

The seeds were implanted in the offspring which had made the fathers of the Republic invulnerable. They were born almost with arms in their hands, and the divine spark of individual sovereignty in their hearts. This magnificent providence which made each man, as it were, a responsible sovereign of the nation, created a Democratic community in which we all only truly breathe by not crushing the right of breathing out of our neighbor. This individual right is the soul of what, being applied to localities, is termed State-rights. This State-rights doctrine has been more than anything else the sentinel of Southern rights and the bulwark of Southern institutions. What Magna Charta was to the barons of England, State-rights has been to the Southern States. Being exactly the reverse of Federalism, it defied that intervention in States' affairs, which would make the latter only appendages of the city of Washington. The States form a

ring on which Washington is affixed as a seal. It is an appendage of these States, not the reverse.

The Democracy, who so reverence their State-rights birth-right, cannot be blinded or seduced into any such belief as that the issue hanging on its fiat embraces any question of slavery. We who are Southern in every sentiment where the rights of the South are concerned, in vain try to see the slightest connection of the slavery question with the reception or rejection of the Lecompton Constitution. We would be untrue to Southern instincts, feelings and education, if we received it; and, in rejecting it, we signalize our career by upholding in a moment of danger and doubt, the sound and healthy doctrines of States-rights.

It is with the will of the ballot-box, and not with the extension of slavery we have to do. No single man or journal, opposed to our views, gives the faintest hope that slavery extension could or would accrue from the measures they advocate. On the contrary, they all with one voice admit the reverse. They also admit that a vote was polled of ten thousand majority against the Lecompton Constitution; and in extenuation of their opposing this majority, go off into the most incoherent quibbles to show that the election was not legal. We have shown from a consecutive and simple argument on the facts, that the election was not only held by authority of the Territorial Legislature, but by the sanction and under the protection of the Federal Government; and that, further, the Federal official duly signed and published his ten thousand majority against the Constitution.

Where then comes the question of slavery?

The question is reduced then, it would seem, to Honesty versus Policy. But in the shadowy policy propounded we cannot see any benefit. Will the admission of Kansas, under the Lecompton Constitution, extend slavery? The Lecompton Constitution advocates say it will not. Will it end the slavery agitation? Not more than if it were rejected.

Then where is the great policy of the South—where?

No, slavery is not the issue at all. It is a question of State-rights, in which the Southern, as well as the Northern Democracy, will find that honesty is the best policy.—*Washington States.*

Renegades.

The *Union* of yesterday denounces Mr. Harris, of Illinois, and other Democrats who sustain his resolutions to investigate the facts connected with the formation of the Lecompton Constitution, as renegades.

This is a piece of assumption on the part of a journal which, for the past ten months, has been the quintessence of imbecility and inconsistency—a journal which has veered and hauled at every point on the Kansas issue, and led off a large portion of the Democracy among quicksands and breakers.

The *Union* asserts that the movement on the part of the opponents of the Lecompton Constitution has been “sectional, insurrectionary, illegal and criminal. Its history has been a history of impudent pretension, bold assumption, and persistent disregard of the Constitution and Government of the United States;” that “Kansas comes here with her Constitution in her hand, asks admission into the Union,” and should not be rejected on account of the “non-submission of the whole Constitution to the people” of Kansas.

On the 7th of July last, the *Union* stated that "*there can be no such thing as ascertaining clearly, and without doubt, the will of the people of Kansas in any way, except by their own expression of it at the polls. A Constitution not subjected to that test, no matter what it contains, will never be acknowledged by its opponents to be anything but a fraud.*"

If the *Union* was correct in July last, who is the renegade now?—*Washington States.*

England Invites the United States to Annex Mexico.

The London *Times*, the national organ of John Bull, throws out a strong hint to Brother Jonathan to take possession of Mexico, and put an end to the distractions and anarchy in that unhappy country. It says that should the United States conclude to swallow Mexico, England would not interfere to prevent it. We copy the article, as it is the most significant we have yet seen from that quarter:

The London *Times*, of February 7th, speaking of the claims of the English creditors of Mexico, makes the following observations: In the recent speech of the Queen of Spain, says the *Times*, a formal announcement was made that the intervention of Great Britain and France has been accepted in the dispute with Mexico, and it will be for the respective Cabinets to consider whether they can properly take any steps that may modify the fate of such a country without recognizing an obligation to see that their interference shall not work injustice to existing private interests. Mexico has now arrived at a point at which any convulsion may improve the prospect of her foreign creditors. In the present state of things they can have no hope, and their great dread, therefore, must be lest it should be perpetuated. If some new military dictator were to arise, or the country were to be absorbed without more delay by the United States, their treatment could not be worse, and it might, especially in the latter case, be much better. Hence, if England and France concert measures to sustain the existing authorities by averting the extraordinary changes that would infallibly result from a war with Spain, they are bound in equity to provide that the assistance thus given shall not enable the Mexican Government to continue with impunity their disregard of every obligation and to shut out from their European bondholders the last possibility of a favorable turn. As to the bondholders insisting upon having the unappropriated lands of the republic assigned to them as indemnity, and afterwards negotiating with the British Government for the transfer of the territory thus acquired, no plan could be more delusive. In the first place, how are the bondholders to "resist?" and in the next, there is not a statesman who would wish to see Great Britain hamper herself with an inch of Mexican ground. Let the United States, when they are finally prepared for it, enjoy all the advantages and responsibility of ownership, and our merchants at Liverpool and elsewhere, will be quite content with the trade that may spring out of it.

The capacity of the Mexican population for appreciating a constitutional rule is not so remarkable that we should volunteer to administer it. All that can be considered advisable is, that if President Comonfort is to be helped by the good offices of England and France, a course should be taken, similar to that lately enforced at Montevideo, to secure that the portion of Customs' dues solemnly and voluntarily pledged to the bondholders, shall no longer be embezzled.

Taney in 1843 vs. Taney in 1857.

Chief Justice Taney turns Dred Scott out of Court on the ground that he is a negro and a slave, and consequently not a citizen and not entitled to sue in the U. S. Courts, even to recover his freedom—the Court having no jurisdiction in such cases. The best answer to this is Chief Justice Taney's own decision in a similar case, that came before him in 1843.

James Asha, a Maryland negro and slave, sued for his freedom in the Circuit Court of the District of Columbia, as Scott did in that of Missouri. The case was in like manner carried up to the United States Supreme Court. But it met with a different reception and a different decision.

Mr. Chief Justice Taney delivered the opinion of the Court. [We quote from *William vs. Ash*. Howard's Reports, vol. 1, pp. 12, 13, 14.]

"This case," said his Honor, "is brought here by writ of error from the Circuit Court, and came before that Court upon a petition for freedom. It appeared upon the trial that the petitioner was the property of Mary Ann Greenfield, of Prince George's County, in the State of Maryland, who died in 1824, having first duly made her last will and testament, whereby, among other things, she bequeathed the petitioner, with sundry other slaves, to her nephew, G. T. Greenfield, with a proviso, in the following words: 'Provided, he shall not carry them out of the State of Maryland, or sell them to any one, in either of which events, I will and devise the said negroes to be free for life.' Upon the death of the testatrix, G. T. Greenfield took possession of the petitioner, (James Asha,) until December, 1839, when he sold the petitioner to the defendant, (Williams,) and the petition for freedom was filed shortly after the sale.

Upon this evidence, the Circuit Court instructed the Jury, that by the fact of such sale of the petitioner, the estate or property of the petitioner so bequeathed to Greenfield, ceased and determined, and he therefore became entitled to his freedom. We think the bequest in the will was a conditional limitation of freedom to the petitioner, and that it took effect the moment he was sold. *The judgment of the Circuit Court is therefore affirmed.*

So that this same Chief Justice then held that a negro might not only be a party to a suit before the U. S. Supreme Court, like any other citizen, but that a slave might go there and recover his freedom.

Which is the law—that expounded by Taney in 1843, or his flat contradiction of himself in 1857?—*Dubuque (Iowa) Tribune, July 7, 1857.*

Abolition of Slavery in Dutch America.

The Dutch possessions on this continent, comprising a portion of Gulana, South America, and several small West India islands, contain some 55,000 slaves, who are to be emancipated under a recent act of the home government. The slaves are to be free in one year after the publication of the law, the government making a fixed compensation for them, but much less than the market rates. The highest price is \$280, for those between the age of 25 and 35. The slaves are to be transferred to the charge of the government, acting by special agents. They are to repay the sums ad-

vanced for their freedom, and those who have the means may free themselves at once. The others are to repay the government in annual instalments. The freed slaves are also to pay annual assessments for the means of education for their children and religious instruction for themselves, and the support of the poor. The slaves are to be hired out by the government agents to the planters, the agents having a general control of the slaves while they are in the transition to freedom. If the planters do not choose to employ them, they are to be settled in colonies on the government lands, under the direction of the agents.

John and Jonathan.

At a dinner recently given to CHARLES MACKAY, at Washington, when "our distinguished guest" was toasted, instead of making a speech in reply, he responded in the following appropriate and beautiful poem:

Said brother Jonathan to John:

"You are the elder born,
And I can bear another's hate,
But not your slightest scorn;
You've lived a life of noble strife,
You've made a world your own,
Why, when I follow in your steps,
Receive me with a groan?"

"I feel the promptings of my youth,
That urge me evermore
To spread my fame, my race, my name,
From shore to furthest shore.
I feel the lightnings in my blood,
The thunders in my hand,
And I must work my destiny,
Whoever may withstand."

"And if you'd give me, brother John,
The sympathy I crave,
And stretch your warm, fraternal hand
Across the Atlantic wave,
I'd give it such a cordial grasp
That earth should start to see,
And ancient crowns and sceptres shake
That fear both you and me."

Said brother John to Jonathan:

"You do my nature wrong;
I never hated, never scorned,
But loved you well and long.
If, children of the self-same sire,
We've quarreled now and then,
'T was only in our early youth,
And not since we were men."

"And if with cautions, cooler blood,
Result of sufferings keen,
I sometimes think you move too fast,
Mistake not what I mean.
I've felt the follies of my youth,
The errors of my prime,
And dreamed for you—my father's son—
A future more sublime."

"And here's my hand, 'tis freely given,
I stretch it o'er the brine,
And wish you from my heart of hearts,
A higher life than mine.
Together let us rule the world—
Together work and thrive;
For if you're only twenty-one,
I'm scarcely thirty-five."

"And I have strength for nobler work
Than e'er my hand has done,
And realms to rule and truths to plant
Beyond the rising sun.
Take you the West and I the East,
We'll spread ourselves abroad, [laws,
With trade and spade, and wholesome
And faith in Man and God."

"Take you the West and I the East!
We speak the self-same tongue
That Milton wrote and Chatham spoke,
And Burns and Shakspeare sung;
And from our tongue, our hand, our heart
Shall countless blessings flow,
To light two darkened hemispheres
That know not where to go."

"Our Anglo-Saxon name and fame,
Our Anglo-Saxon speech [Heaven,
Received their mission straight from
To civilize and teach.
So here's my hand, I stretch it forth;
Ye meaner lands, look on! [firm
From this day hence there's friendship
'Twixt Jonathan and John!"

"They shook their hands, this noble pair,
And o'er the "electric chain"
Came daily messages of Peace
And love betwixt them twain.
When other nations, sore oppressed,
Like dark in sorrow's night,
They look to Jonathan and John,
And hope for coming light."